

and expansion programs—buttressed by the strong new measures announced in July—we are making a major effort to bring the U.S. balance of payments into equilibrium. But again, there is a role that only you can play.

The Trade Expansion Act and the forthcoming tariff negotiations with the European Economic Community and other nations are opening a new era of world trade and international business opportunity. The time has come to seize these opportunities, to seek out the potentials that lie in foreign markets.

Although many producers have responded quickly and successfully to the growing challenges of foreign competition, we are far from being a nation of exporters. U.S. firms can meet the test of the world market successfully if they search out their opportunities aggressively.

I urge you—and the prospect for new profits urges you—to redouble your own export efforts. Your active personal support for the White House Conference on Export Expansion to be held September 17 and 18 can also contribute to a successful national export effort.

This Nation's efforts to increase production and profits comprise another key element in the improvement of our balance-of-payments position. As we expand our home market, and increase rates of return by cutting costs and making full use of our productive capacity, investment funds that now go abroad will stay at home. And as they stay at home, they will help to build the base for faster growth of our own economy.

#### PRICES

Our remarkable wholesale price stability in the past 5 years while prices in most other industrial countries were rising substantially has given us a solid base for an improved international competitive position.

Investment to reduce costs and improve products and measures to advance the skill and productivity of our workers will further strengthen our competitive position—but only if the productivity gains are not dissipated in fruitless spirals of rapidly rising

wages chasing higher prices, and vice versa. That is why we have called upon labor and business to exercise responsible restraint, basing wage and profit increases on fair shares of rising productivity. The continued need for a vigilant national effort to avoid a resumption of the inflation of past periods will become even more urgent as we move closer to full employment and full-capacity operation. Relative price stability can be continued if all of us—labor, business, and government—work at it. If the overall level of prices is not to rise, price increases on some products and services must be matched by price decreases in others. Such increases and decreases are a necessary and desirable part of a free market economy.

But what is unnecessary and undesirable is a general rise in prices. Current prices cannot be looked upon as a floor—let alone as a springboard for higher prices in the future. American business pioneered in exploiting the possibilities of mass markets—of seeking higher profit levels through lower prices and expanding sales, not through increased profit rates on limited output. This basic philosophy is as relevant today as it was 50 years ago and time has proved its worth.

#### EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The achievement of full employment and of a faster rate of economic growth will be of prime importance in giving substance to "equal opportunity." But beyond this, you, as businessmen, can play a leading role in giving all Americans a direct chance to share in the creation of a stronger economy and in the fruits of that economy. In communities all across the Nation, businessmen hire workers and serve customers and thus have an opportunity in their everyday business conduct to make a decisive contribution to the practice of American democracy. I ask of all of us that we judge each other not as white or nonwhite but as Americans and in so doing expand our markets, increase our productivity, and strengthen our Nation.

#### THE JOINT TASK AHEAD

Business can help on all these fronts—on tax revisions, on investments, on exports, on

prices, on equality of opportunity. But business cannot achieve our common goals alone. This is too much to ask of any group. Nor, and let me make this clear, can government do it alone.

Business, labor, and government are partners and no one partner can complete the task if the other partners are not doing their shares. That is why, in much of what I have said, I have spoken of what we can do together.

For business decisions not only influence current and prospective economic conditions, they also reflect these conditions. It is government's task to create a climate in which your decisions to expand and invest, to export, and to assist in defending the stable dollar, are sensible and meaningful.

The present economic expansion is an example of the interaction of government policies and business performance. Part of the rise in economic activity is the result of business decisions made in response to last year's investment tax credit and depreciation guideline revision. The latter were government policies; but you made them effective.

A recent private survey indicated that over \$1 billion of the business expenditures on new plant and equipment planned for this year are directly related to last year's tax credit and revised depreciation guidelines—measures the Executive and the Congress took to encourage new investments. Without this \$1-billion margin, business investment plans for 1963 would have shown much less change from 1962.

I have no reason to doubt that the future will tell the same story: That government can pursue policies to encourage expansion, and we will do that; that businessmen can make these policies effective by playing the dynamic role the free market assigns to them, and you will do that.

Our aims are the same. If you fail, all America fails. But, in fact, we will succeed. The results will demonstrate to men everywhere the power and thrust of the American free enterprise system—the mightiest engine of economic progress the world has known.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, from the trivialities of small concerns that irritate and frustrate, we turn to Thee, that we may regain a sense of the immensities and of the vast consequences of questions which cry for decisions on the most commonplace days and ways.

In all our dealings with matters of public weal, save us from posing as oracles of a righteousness and a wisdom we do not possess. With our paucity of knowledge, keep us from superficial judgments, lest we, too, be unjustly judged.

In such an hour in human relationships, save those who must speak for this Nation set upon a hill from agitation without vision, passion without poise, and heat without light.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 5, 1963, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### COMMITTEES MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Upon request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

# EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

## REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES RELATING TO ADVANCED SATURN LAUNCH VEHICLE

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of facilities relating to the advanced Saturn launch vehicle; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

## AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

A letter from Harold C. Woodward, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, expressing his opposition to proposed legislation relating to amendment of section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, transmitted to the Senate by Chairman Swidler of that Commission, on June 12, 1963; to the Committee on Commerce.

## REPORT ON EXCESSIVE COSTS OF MAINTENANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES UNDER LOAN GUARANTEE AND DIRECT LOAN PROGRAMS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the excessive costs of maintenance and management of properties acquired upon default of loans made under the loan guarantee and direct loan programs, Veterans' Administration, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORT OF CONTINUED USE OF UNECONOMICAL FIRST-CLASS AIR-TRAVEL ACCOMMODATIONS BY EMPLOYEES OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continued use of uneconomical first-class, air-travel accommodations by employees of defense contractors, Department of Defense, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORT ON UNREASONABLY HIGH PRICES PAID FOR NICKEL CADMIUM AIRCRAFT BATTERIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unreasonably high prices paid for nickel cadmium aircraft storage batteries under negotiated fixed-price contract AF 01(601)-22629 with Sonotone Corp., Elmsford, N.Y., Department of the Air Force, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORT ON ILLEGAL USE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the illegal use of operation and maintenance funds for rehabilitation and construction of family housing and construction of a related facility of the Department of Defense, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORT ON APPLICATION FOR LOAN UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the application for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 by the Hooper Irrigation Co., of Weber and Davis Counties, Utah (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## AMENDMENT OF CONCESSION CONTRACT IN LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract assigned to Clarence W. Anderson and Margarette E. Anderson, authorizing the operation of a trailer village at Boulder Beach in the Lake Mead National Recreation Area (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## ENACTMENT OF INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON DETAINERS INTO LAW

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enact the Interstate Agreement on Detainers into law (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## FIRST LT. DAVID A. STAYER

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Stayer, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the convention of the National Prohibition Party at St. Louis, Mo., favoring the repeal of the equal time rules, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Graham A. Martin, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Thailand;

William Matson Roth, of California, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador;

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minis-

ter, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Burma;

Gen. Herbert B. Powell, U.S. Army, retired, of Oregon, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to New Zealand;

William O. Hall, of Oregon, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in addition, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably sundry nominations in the diplomatic and foreign service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Roy T. Davis, Jr., of Maryland, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the diplomatic and foreign service.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2121. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manoranjan Dutta and Mrs. Kanak Dutta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2122. A bill to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2123. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

## RESOLUTION

### ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "CASTRO NETWORK IN THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 193); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed, for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, five thousand copies of part 6 of hearings by the Subcommittee on Internal Security on the "Castro Network in the United States."

### ADDITIONAL TIME FOR CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN TO ESTABLISH RESIDENCE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide additional time for certain homestead entrymen to establish residence.



These individuals, residents of my State, have filed homestead applications in Arizona and made good-faith efforts to improve the property but due to fortuitous circumstances have been unable to comply with the residence requirements.

I hope that the committee can give consideration to this bill and report it soon in order that these individuals can move onto the property and proceed with development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2122) to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL TAX EXEMPTION FOR STUDENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional exemption of \$600 a year for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning.

A generation ago, Mr. President, a high school education was widely regarded as sufficient to compete successfully in adult life. The student who continued his education at the college level was the exception. And the cost of that education was modest.

Today, increasing numbers of our youngsters are finding that there is a shrinking demand for the skills and knowledge developed only through the high school level. Our very national security requires that we produce more scientists and engineers. We need more doctors, technicians, physicists. At the same time, our developing culture and economy require more advanced training in the arts and humanities, in business administration, in virtually every field.

Along with the increased enrollment in our colleges we have witnessed a steep increase in the costs of higher education. While it is still possible to work your way through college as a number of us here in this Chamber have done, the difficulty of doing this grows every year.

Parents who thought they were providing for their children's college education with a plan developed 15 or 20 years ago are finding their resources alarmingly inadequate. Large numbers of families are going into debt in order to help finance the education of their sons and daughters.

The bill I am today introducing seeks to provide some relief from the burden borne by these parents, by the students themselves and, in the case of young married couples, for the spouse of the student.

Mr. President, my opposition to so-called general aid to education is well known. It is based in large part on the concern that Federal aid inevitably means Federal control. This bill has

the virtue of assisting students and their families financially, though not overgenerously, without the strings of Federal dictation.

The bill (S. 2123) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], may be added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 176) to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs—for the Veterans' Administration, submitted by me on July 24, 1963.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK KOWALSKI TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, September 17, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, of the nomination of Frank Kowalski, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, for term expiring August 9, 1966.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post published a tribute to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for the fine speech he made the other day on the international balance of payments.

I concur in a great deal, although not all, of what the Senator from New York said. In the words of the editorial, Senator JAVITS' remarks have the unique virtue of cutting through to the heart of the matter and viewing the economic problems of the free world from a long-term perspective.

Indeed, Senator JAVITS' speech did this. But it also had the rare virtue of dealing with a broad and complex problem in a comprehensive way. Senator JAVITS covered the subject fully and brilliantly.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "JAVITS' Long View," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### JAVITS' LONG VIEW

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS once again demonstrated his firm grasp of the issues underlying this country's balance-of-payments deficit in a perceptive speech that has attracted too little attention. The challenge posed by the outflow of capital from the United States has elicited responses which are at best capable of dealing with short-term symptoms. JAVITS' remarks, made on the floor of the Senate, have the unique virtue of cutting through to the heart of the matter and viewing the economic problems of the free world from a long-term perspective.

In the Senator's view, "The heart of the problem is the international monetary mechanism which makes the adjustment of one economy to another in the free world extremely difficult." And he adds that:

"The basic flaw in the existing international monetary system is that it depends for additional liquidity or credit on continuing the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States which add dollars and gold to finance rapidly growing international \* \* \* transactions. To the extent we succeed in eliminating our balance-of-payments deficit, we also remove liquidity from the system."

In order to resolve the liquidity dilemma and prepare for the changes that would follow upon successful efforts to eliminate the tariff barriers to freer world trade, the Senator proposes that the United States should take the initiative in convening an international monetary conference. This body would devise a world payments system which takes cognizance of changes in the world economy since the Bretton Woods Conference days in 1944. And it would also inquire into the unresolved problems encountered by underdeveloped countries in marketing their exports and consider rules for the strengthening of international competition.

The administration's efforts to resolve the balance-of-payments problem have been singularly lacking in boldness and imagination. Since conventional measures, after 3 years, have produced little in the way of tangible results, Senator JAVITS' proposal should be seriously considered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin for his graciousness in submitting for the Record the editorial which refers to my speech. I shall carefully analyze the editorial; and if anything further needs to be said about my position, I shall certainly say it.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy and kindness to me.

#### SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO DEMOCRACY: EXPANDED NETWORK TV NEWS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some of the major television networks have expanded their news policy, and now are engaged in what I believe is a historic policy of increasing the regular nightly national 15-minute news program to one-half an hour of news in prime time. Too little attention has been paid to what I believe approaches a revolution in the provision of news to the American people. Tens of millions of informed Americans follow the news primarily by

watching and listening to these programs, because they serve them as eyes and ears to inform them of what is happening in their Government, their Nation, and the world. This is now a prime way in which the world's greatest democracy is informed and able to function as a democracy.

I recognize that this policy may be an expensive one for the television networks. However, regardless of whether it makes business sense, it does make very good citizenship sense; it is a wonderful asset to our democracy, for it enables our people to be better informed regarding what is going on in the world and to have better understanding of the complicated issues, which require explanation and analysis, as well as reporting.

These facts should be noted in the U.S. Senate. I commend the television networks on their fine work and their adoption of this new policy.

In my experience in Wisconsin, in speaking to high school students, I have found that the morning after a long documentary is shown on the television networks, their questions are almost entirely confined to what they saw the night before. This reflects the amazing impact of TV on the American people. I am sure that what is true of the high school students of Wisconsin is also true of millions of adult Americans. The impact of such programs is enormous.

So I believe the new policy of providing greater information in a longer period of time on our television networks is a great contribution to better understanding by the American people of the issues of the day; and I commend the television networks for their action.

#### THE BIRMINGHAM SCHOOLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of Senators to the implications of the situation existing at Birmingham, where the Governor of the State of Alabama has brought about the closing of public schools which were to be desegregated according to order of the Federal court.

These events are altogether too reminiscent of the actions of Governor Faubus in Arkansas, which finally resulted in the calling out of Federal troops. In that situation there was also some fuzziness as to what the State really had in mind in posting troops at the doors of schools which were to be desegregated. In the case of Little Rock, there were disorders in the schools. In the case of Birmingham, a situation existed in which the action of the Governor in not making clear to the people of the State, especially the minority which is so rabidly segregationist, that the law would be enforced and that the law includes the laws of the United States, resulted in a situation in which he gave credence to those who would create public disorder, and gave the appearance of inability or unwillingness to enforce the laws of the United States, with the resultant disorder and disaster to the school system of Birmingham, which now has occurred.

Mr. President, I know the Attorney General is very seriously considering this question, as is the President; and it may very well be that the only way by which the schools in Birmingham can be reopened, pursuant to the orders of the Federal courts, which I am sure will be forthcoming in due course of time, inasmuch as the law is clear on that score, will be, again, with the aid of Federal troops. It may very well be that the President will have to send U.S. marshals or U.S. troops into Birmingham, in order to assure that the children of adult citizens of the United States shall have the rights of citizens of the United States inasmuch as they, too, are, of course, citizens of the United States, in that sense of the word.

Mr. President, in connection with these very serious and trying decisions—which President Eisenhower made, which President Kennedy has made, and which, in the case of Birmingham, President Kennedy may well have to make—it is valuable to the Chief Executive to have an expression of opinion from those of us in high places in the legislative branch and from the public itself, indicating support and understanding of the situation. The American people should clearly understand that there is no immunity from the disorder, difficulty, or danger arising in this situation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the limitation in the morning hour, the time available to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. There must be a balancing of the public interest as against these dangers. Dangers do exist, no matter what one does, as is evidenced by what already has occurred at Birmingham. A lesser danger to the people of the United States results from enforcement of the rights of citizens of the United States within the State of Alabama—to which those rights extend, just as they do to every other part of the Nation. Such enforcement would be by the United States, if need be, in the event that the State authorities—and certainly it is always preferable to have the laws enforced by the State authorities—are unable or unwilling to enforce them.

The President should know that in these dire circumstances, he has the support of the people of the country and of those in high places in the legislative branch who feel, as I do, that all measures, which may be necessary for the maintenance of laws in the interests of the Nation, should be taken; for ours is a nation of laws, not of men—whether in Alabama or in any other area of the Nation.

The Nation should assure him of that. The Nation should support him in whatever decision he has to make to see that the laws of the United States are enforced in Alabama, that the orders of the Federal courts are carried out, and that

the children who seek the rights of citizens of the United States are not denied an education in the public schools of the State which should be open to them. It is the manifest duty of the States, as it is that of the United States, to protect these citizens in the exercise of their rights.

#### WALL STREET JOURNAL CHALLENGES BASIS FOR BIGGER DEFICIT

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the lead editorial appearing in this morning's issue of the Wall Street Journal is stimulating because it raises an interesting intellectual challenge to the advance guard economists. It questions those who say that the Federal debt cannot be compared with private debt. When they want to justify deficits they argue that the Federal Government, unlike the private individual or family or corporation, does not really have to repay the debt.

But these same economists are right out in front in comparing private debt with the public debt when they support a bigger deficit on the grounds that private debt has grown faster than the Federal debt.

The argument made by the Wall Street Journal is not that private and public debt are the same. Of course, they are quite different. But the editorial points out that there are serious penalties and payments that must be made when public as well as private debt is increased, as the Federal deficit has been increased in the past. The editorial points out also that private debt, while increasing, is constantly being paid off, but our Federal debt has not been reduced significantly for a long time.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Excuse for Excess" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EXCUSE FOR EXCESS

It sometimes seems as though the advocates of perennial Federal deficits have worked themselves into an intellectual cul-de-sac.

On the one hand they contend that the National Government's budgeting cannot fairly be compared with that of individuals, businesses or even other levels of political authority; it's supposedly in a special category. Yet on the other hand they point to private indebtedness as a justification for Federal deficits; why shouldn't the Government be allowed to do what most families and companies do all the time?

To begin to sort out this multiple confusion, it's true that many people seem infatuated with charge account and credit card living. For ourselves, we are old-fashioned enough to wish there were a more general regard for savings and living within incomes.

But there is nothing inherently wrong, or necessarily dangerous to the Nation's financial structure, in large accumulations of private debt. One reason is that all concerned understand that debt must be repaid at some point; the few who may think otherwise can expect to end up in trouble.

This common consent is missing from the attitude of many Federal economists and their academic supporters. The public debt



continues to mount as the budget deficits pile up year after year. Not only is there no thought of paying off any part of the debt; the policy of deliberately planned deficits insures against it.

To see no danger in such practice must require a major effort of the imagination. The deficits themselves are potentially inflationary; the growth of the debt imposes burdens and distortions on the whole economy. Just to service it now costs more than \$10 billion a year.

Apart from those evils, the debt represents a huge overextension of public credit. Whereas private debt is constantly in the process of repayment, public debt can cause trouble because there is neither attempt nor intent to reduce at all.

It is no answer to say, as the officials often do, that the burden of the debt is declining because the debt is declining as a proportion of gross national product. The GNP in itself is swelled by the enormous Federal spending which helps keep the debt so high. And no amount of percentages can alter the fact that the debt has been steadily increasing instead of declining. Such statistical doubletalk should not commend itself to men in positions of responsibility.

Now by what special dispensation is it assumed that the Central Government can escape the consequences which apply elsewhere in the economy? Though differences obviously exist between public and private business, they are not of such a nature as to make it safe for the Government to continually defy economic laws.

For one difference, only the Government can create money. This unfortunately is also a way of saying that only the Government can actually cause an inflation, though other forces can contribute to its development. The belief that inflation is a form of economic salvation is indeed a sad delusion.

If it is accepted that creating new money is an unhealthy method of attempting to cover debts, then it seems clear that the Government is very much in the position of a householder or business enterprise. Far from being some unique entity wholly detached from the workings of the general economy, the Government by its nature is also subject to the sometimes painful rule that the money must come from somewhere.

We suspect that, deep down, the devotees of unending deficits know it. Otherwise they would not get themselves in the unwieldy position of putting the Government in a special category while at the same time taking comfort from the extent of private debt. That excuse for excess should be scant solace for them or the Nation.

#### STATISTICAL EXAGGERATION OF ECONOMIC LAG

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an article by J. A. Livingston, the perceptive financial columnist, calls into question the argument that our economy has been lagging quite as seriously as gloom sayers claim. He does so by pointing out that the usual basis for the argument that the economy has been lagging is that during the period from 1957 through 1963 there was a lesser expansion of our economy than in the period from 1947 through 1957. Livingston properly points out, on the basis of studies by a number of economists, that the period 1947 through 1957 was one of recovery from World War II and an expansion which resulted from the Korean war, and that the comparison is not fair. If we consider the most recent 5 or 6 years, including the past

2½ years of the Kennedy administration, it will be seen that we have done quite well in terms of our historic American experience.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Business Outlook—J.F.K. Challenged on Lag," by J. A. Livingston, published in the Washington Post, September 4, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 4, 1963]

J.F.K. CHALLENGED ON LAG

(By J. A. Livingston)

Have we become a Nation of growth addicts?

The August Federal Reserve Bulletin suggests we have. A staff paper by Clayton Gehman, an experienced, studious economist at the Reserve Board, directly challenges the thesis of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers that in recent years economic expansion has fallen far short of the long-term trend line and the Nation's potential.

The contention has important political connotations. Perhaps the President is using a false conclusion to push policies of taxation and spending to achieve the unattainable.

Gehman argues that a false base—a poorly chosen period—fosters the melancholy conclusion that "U.S. growth has been lagging."

This conclusion—this point of view—dominated the 1963 Report of the Council of Economic Advisers and influenced Presidential policy.

The Council said: "The 1957-62 period of economic development matches neither our own record of performance between 1947 and 1957, nor gains achieved by other free nations. The annual growth rates of output, income, and productivity all run about 1 percent lower in the most recent period (1957-62) than in the previous decade (1947-57)."

Not once does Gehman mention the Council's report, but his rebuttal is unmistakable:

"The 1947-57 period reflected some unusual conditions. Growth then was more rapid than in most earlier periods back to 1900 and more rapid—especially in the Korean period, 1950-53—than could reasonably be expected to continue. For the whole period from 1962 back to 1899 the average rate of growth in industrial production was about 4 percent per year."

Gehman has a case. When economic activity was slackening in 1949-50, the Nation retooled for the Korean war. Munitions production soared, consumers overstocked in fear of shortages. This overstocking resulted in a letdown, which depressed the subsequent rate of growth.

Gehman emerges with these conclusions:

"1. Growth in U.S. economic activity in recent years has been close to longtime rates."

"2. Increased productive efficiency in the use of labor and materials has been achieved."

"3. As a result, there has been more unemployment and less demand for materials than there would have been otherwise."

These observations are underlined by this statement:

"If one starts with 1959 and compares increases in either the gross national product or industrial production over the next 3 years, the rate of expansion in each has been at least as rapid as in similar business expansions starting with 1946 or 1955. This holds true even though the latest period includes the 1960-61 recession."

If Gehman is correct, then how is it possible that so many economists have accepted

the slow-growth theory? In addition to the poor choice of years, Gehman suggests several reasons.

Growth trends have been calculated on the basis of gross national product estimates of the Department of Commerce. These estimates are exactly that—estimates—and can be underestimates.

Gehman thinks the Commerce Department underallowed for expansion in recent years in noncorporate purchases of capital goods. Instances: Your doctor buys an X-ray machine, or a lawyer purchases copying equipment, or a dentist high-speed drills, or accounting and brokerage firms computers. These are not directly included in the estimates.

Further, gross national product estimates are in dollars. They have to be deflated—price changes have to be removed. Gehman politely suggests that in recent years the price deflations have been overadequate. They've understated growth.

The study is presented in the Reserve Bulletin as a staff paper. It is not endorsed by the Federal Reserve Board. But you can be sure it was gone over carefully by the economists and statisticians in the Board and that the Governors knew about it. They'll have to bat back the political brickbats.

Caution: It would be a mistake to assume that Gehman is satisfied with the rate of growth. Who is?

He'd like to see it greater than 4 percent. Who wouldn't? What a boon to employment that would be.

Yet his message is unmistakably clear. Let's not sulk or despair because statistically the Soviet Union or countries in Western Europe has exceeded America's rate of growth in recent years.

We haven't really deviated from past trends. Our economic zest hasn't lessened. On the contrary, productivity has increased. We are using fewer men and less material to get the same rate of growth as earlier. That's why, unfortunately, we have unemployment.

Therefore, we have to question whether—by forced effort, by dint of Federal deficits or hurry-up tax cuts—we can sustain a rate of growth beyond the historic 4 percent.

#### MILWAUKEE TV STATION CALLS TITO CHAMPION TIGHTROPE WALKER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in an editorial a few days ago, the Milwaukee television station WTMJ-TV commented on the close and friendly relationship between Marshal Tito and Khrushchev. The editorial stated that the relationship between Tito and Khrushchev is "like long lost brothers." It also said that the relationship will continue as long as Khrushchev thinks he "needs Tito on his side."

This editorial raises once again the question of why we continue to provide foreign aid to Yugoslavia. I wish to make clear that the most-favored-nation treatment of Yugoslavia may be something quite different. One might argue possibly for treating Yugoslavia equitably in terms of trade. This is a more complex and difficult question. But it is very hard to justify giving the hard-earned tax dollars of the American taxpayer to a Communist dictator who is working with and for the Kremlin. But that is what our policy has been in the past, and will continue to be if the pending foreign aid bill, as it is now in committee, is passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TITO CHAMPION TIGHTROPE WALKER

Russia and Yugoslavia are putting on another big display of friendship designed to blot out the hatreds of the past. Premier Khrushchev flew to Belgrade where he and President Tito greeted each other like long lost brothers. The airport greeting was almost a carbon copy of Khrushchev's reception for Tito at the Moscow railroad station last December when the Yugoslav leader visited Russia. At that time the meeting was billed as a 2-week vacation for Tito but foreign observers said it looked more like a political honeymoon for an estranged couple.

Tito, in giving Khrushchev the red-carpet treatment now is causing world observers to wonder whether the carpet's color will turn from the subdued revisionist red to the garish scarlet of a Soviet satellite. It seems extremely unlikely, however, that 70-year-old Tito will give up his role of world champion tightrope walker—a role in which he seems to enjoy balancing Yugoslavia's position between East and West. And a role which has proved valuable in the reconstruction and economic growth of his country since World War II.

There have been many twists and turns in Soviet-Yugoslav relations since Stalin kicked Tito out of the Soviet bloc in 1948. After Stalin's death, Khrushchev went to Belgrade to apologize for Stalin's action. In 1956 the two leaders exchanged visits. And at that time they issued a new declaration of solidarity, with Moscow apparently accepting the doctrine of separate roads to socialism. Then came the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolt and Tito tore up the agreement. The ideological warfare between the two again was resumed. By summer of 1958 relations between the two countries were as low as they had ever been since Stalin's death. At one point Khrushchev called Tito "the Trojan horse of communism's enemies." But a year later the two were meeting secretly in Rumania where they reportedly agreed on concrete forms of cooperation. Last December at a time of deteriorating relations with Red China, Khrushchev conceded that Yugoslavia was a Socialist country. And Tito, in turn, denounced Communist China.

How long will the brotherly love last this time? The answer is obvious—as long as Khrushchev thinks he needs Tito on his side. And as long as it lasts Tito can be expected to get as many economic concessions as possible. For his is not just an empty title of world champion tightrope walker.

#### TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure to bring to the attention of the Senate today an editorial commending our distinguished presiding officer, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON. While some in this body probably would not agree with the particular efforts for which the Vice President is commended, I am sure we would all agree completely with the writer's theme that he is a man of great courage. The traits which made him one of our Nation's greatest Senate majority leaders have made him one of our Nation's greatest Vice Presidents. His complete dedication to the American people has advanced civilization toward its goal of universal freedom and peace. When full equality

and freedom are achieved in our great Nation, when the goal of the American Revolution is finally secured for all our people, the record will show that the leadership of LYNDON B. JOHNSON has been instrumental in the attainment of this goal. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the St. Joseph News Press on August 16, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CARRYING THE FIGHT

Time and again in recent months, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON has demonstrated his loyalty to his Chief by hewing close to the administration line on civil rights.

Sometimes his pronouncements in favor of the Kennedy-backed civil rights program have put him in hot water with the southerners with whom the big Vice President from Texas has so long been associated. It hasn't seemed to bother him in the least.

At Houston, Tex., this week, Vice President JOHNSON told city officials from across the Nation that they must guarantee civil rights to all citizens or face the loss of local self-government. His statement openly angered certain southern delegates to the American Municipal Association session he addressed. That was to be expected.

Vice President JOHNSON easily could remain in the background and let others assume the full burden of carrying the civil rights fight. He hasn't though, and for that he is to be commended. He has shown his courage.

#### TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, our Economic Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has recently held hearings on S. 750, the truth-in-lending bill, in New York, Pittsburgh, and Louisville. The testimony in all of these cities was excellent and the interest keen. Louisville is blessed in having two of the finest and most public-spirited newspapers in the country, and I ask unanimous consent that editorials on the subject from the Louisville Times and the Louisville Courier-Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Aug. 27, 1963]

#### THE CREDIT HEARING WAS VALUABLE

The hearing on credit practices conducted here over the weekend by a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate was colorful and valuable to the extent that it focused attention on a facet of the economy that should be of vital concern to the general public. We are, after all, a nation of installment buyers, and personal credit of all kinds reaches new heights every passing year.

Specifically, the hearing was on a truth-in-lending bill sponsored by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois. It would require all firms and institutions dealing in consumer credit to disclose how much this credit is costing in both dollars and cents and the simple annual rate on the unpaid balance. The bill has nothing to do with regulating the charges; its objective is to inform the consuming public how much it is paying for credit, thus enabling the consumer to shop for credit in the same way he shops for merchandise. Credit abuses exist. The victims are all too often the poor and the unin-

formed. The Douglas bill would not guarantee these people protection from sharp practices. It would make it more difficult, however, for those extending credit to conceal its real cost to the consumer.

The opposition to the bill—retail merchants, commercial banks, and some other lending institutions—contend that it is impossible to express the cost of credit in terms of a simple annual percentage charge on certain kinds of loans and on revolving credit accounts. Senator DOUGLAS and those who support his bill maintain that it can be done.

It may be that the Douglas bill, as presently drafted, is not the answer for certain types of installment credit. The Senator said he was willing to consider revisions. But it was clear from the testimony of opposition witnesses at the hearing that it is not compromise but the death of the Douglas bill that they desire. They want no part of Federal legislation in this field. The States, they argue, should do the job. But the question is, will they? Kentucky has made some progress. The 1962 general assembly enacted a watered-down version of the Douglas bill, which requires that the cost of credit, including installment credit, be stated in dollars and cents. This legislation was drafted in large part by representatives of retail merchants, who came forward with it as a substitute for a stronger bill that was first submitted. This legislation undoubtedly was a net gain. But is it enough? Some witnesses testified that it isn't. One of them was a Louisville attorney who has conducted a comprehensive study of credit practices in Kentucky for the health and welfare council of the community chest.

In any event, even if the Kentucky legislation is adequate, a need remains for some version of the Douglas bill on the national level, for many States do not have legislation like Kentucky's. Perhaps eventually they will, but meanwhile the consumer is at a disadvantage.

[From the Louisville Times, Aug. 27, 1963]

#### THE INFORMED BUYER HAS A CHOICE

Opponents of the truth-in-lending bill sponsored by U.S. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS insist that the name is unfair. The implication, they point out with some reason, is that anyone who is against it must be for falsehood in lending (or in charges for retail credit, which the bill also would cover).

The opposing witnesses who appeared before Senator DOUGLAS' subcommittee here Saturday were unanimous in denying that they approve of misrepresentation or concealment of the true cost of credit. They said that what they object to is a provision in the proposed law which would require a statement of total cost of credit in terms of simple annual percentage of the principal sum involved. They don't like the term "simple annual interest" because they insist that more than interest is often involved—items like service charges, insurance of the borrower or perhaps searching titles.

What concerns the borrower, or the buyer on a time payment plan, is the cost of using credit. It makes no difference to him whether the cost is called interest, insurance, or a service charge. Kentucky has a State law that requires the seller or the lender to inform the buyer or the borrower what credit will cost him in dollars and cents. It does not require a statement of the cost in annual percentage rate.

Thus, if he buys a refrigerator on a 24-month time payment plan, he can read his whole contract and find out how much more he will pay than if he were paying cash. The difference may seem fairly large, but if he can manage the monthly payments he will be disinclined to work out the percentage rate, even if he knows how.

Generally, opponents of the Douglas bill say they approve of Kentucky's credit law that requires a statement of credit cost in



dollars and cents. Most of them, in fact, supported that law—as an alternative to one which would have required a statement of cost in annual percentage rate.

Their opposition to the Douglas bill is pitched primarily on the annual percentage rate requirement, but they further oppose it on the ground that credit regulation of this sort should be a State responsibility. Since American banking is based on Federal law, this contention seems somewhat ingenuous.

The argument is advanced with conviction by opponents of the Douglas bill that it is impossible to state the simple annual cost rate on revolving credit accounts in stores, and on certain "skip payment" loans by banks. Bankers and merchants whose judgment we trust have advanced this argument.

Yet we find it hard to believe that it is impossible to establish a statement of simple annual percentage while it is perfectly feasible to state costs in dollars and cents.

One revealing exchange took place between Senator DOUGLAS and a local department store executive. The department store treasurer said it would be impossible to include the annual rate in monthly statements to customers because "there is no time limit involved." Senator DOUGLAS said the annual rate could be expressed simply at 12 times the monthly rate or service charge (which in most systems of revolving credit is 1½ percent). The annual percentage rate in such an instance, Senator DOUGLAS pointed out, would be 18.

"Where's the justice," demanded the witness, "in forcing us to state 18 percent when the credit unions can state 12 percent? We're not in the moneylending business."

The justice, as Senator DOUGLAS quickly pointed out, is that a statement of the cost of credit is due the buyer—which is what the Douglas bill is about.

It is quite true that the merchant offering revolving credit accounts may borrow from banks, paying their interest rate, to finance his own time payment operation. He must collect enough over and above cash price of his sales to pay the bank interest and to carry the overhead of his credit operation. It may be reasonable to argue that he should be able to realize something from the transaction for his own trouble; he is not in business for philanthropy.

But the whole point of the debate is that the buyer or borrower should know what he is being asked to pay for the use of credit. Then, if he wants to, he may borrow the cash price at a lower "simple annual rate," pay the merchant at once, and bypass a middleman creditor.

Senator DOUGLAS said in Louisville that he "is ready to confer with the retail merchants of the State and the Nation to iron out details and language of the bill." If the only objection (aside from the Federal law aspect) is to the difficulty of computing simple annual percentage rates, this should not be an insurmountable barrier—given the will to surmount.

#### NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, foremost in the minds of our citizens is the question of whether the limited nuclear test ban treaty, which the Senate will be debating early next week, is in the best interests of the United States.

A highly informative article based on solid facts on this subject by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has appeared in the September 7 issue of the *Saturday Evening Post*. I would like to make this article a part of my remarks and recommend its

reading by those who are concerned for our country's welfare.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

#### BEWARE THE TEST BAN

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The limited nuclear test ban is a Russian beartrap. It will help the Soviet Union and hurt the United States. It will allow the Russians to catch up in nuclear-weapons development, in which they are behind, and prevent us from catching up in areas in which they are ahead. This topsy-turvy treaty raises the ominous possibility that, in time, the Soviet Union could gain the clear-cut nuclear supremacy it needs to achieve communism's unalterable goal of world domination.

Despite serious ideological differences between Moscow and Peking, neither has abandoned the idea that the West shall be buried. Their dispute is over how, when and how deep.

For a decade and a half America's overall nuclear superiority has deterred the Kremlin from seeking its goal quickly and explosively with nuclear weapons. Our ability to retaliate with fearsome damage to the Soviet Union has made that method too costly. Our deterrent also has curbed Russia's cold war activities. Fears that limited wars might get out of hand and escalate to nuclear war have tempered Soviet adventurism.

America's superior nuclear arsenal has been maintained by American scientists in unrestricted competition with Russian scientists. Now the rules of competition are to be changed. All testing is to go underground. President Kennedy has said this will be a "first step" toward reducing world tensions, freeing us from the fear and danger of fallout, preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and limiting the arms race in ways that will strengthen our security more than unrestricted testing. He has argued that it is a step toward peace well worth taking, because the terms of the treaty will allow the United States to retain its present nuclear superiority.

But will it allow us to retain superiority? Is it a step toward peace as we understand it—or as the Hungarian freedom fighters savagely were taught it?

Here is the nub of the matter and here there is room for discussion—and dissent. Power, not good intentions, rules the world. No one knows this better than the Russians. Why, after all these truculent years, have they suddenly decided there shall be a test ban agreement? What is behind Khrushchev's quick change from the frowning Russian rocket rattler of last October's Cuban crisis to the smiling Russian treaty peddler of today? Has the wolf jumped out of his skin and a lamb jumped in? Hardly. He obviously believes the pact is giving him something at the expense of the United States. Khrushchev thinks he is getting a bargain. He is.

While allowing underground testing, the treaty bans explosions in the atmosphere, underwater or in space. For the Soviets, nothing could be better. With underground tests they can develop the kinds of small, tactical weapons that the United States has been building successfully for years. They will have the unrestricted opportunity to equal or surpass us. In the atmosphere the Russians already have made tremendous advances with strategic weapons far more powerful than any that the United States has. In 1961, when Khrushchev coolly broke the testing moratorium, Russian scientists detonated one weapon with a force of 58 megatons. It can be scaled up to a yield of 100 megatons and safely placed in Soviet arsenals without further testing. The exact yield of the biggest American weapon is a

military secret, but a good bet is that the Red Army calculates it at not over 30 megatons.

During the 1961 series of 31 atmospheric shots and continuing with last year's series of 49, the U.S.S.R. also made some startling advances in the development of more sophisticated nuclear weapons. Caught flatfooted by the sudden Soviet test resumption in September, 1961, we could not get our own atmospheric series underway until April, 1962. With nearly 90 tests, we made some significant advances on our own, but technical difficulties cut our high altitude experiments severely. On balance, we need to continue testing far more than the Russians. These are the reasons why:

First, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has testified that the Russians, like ourselves, are rapidly hiding their missile bases and other military installations far underground in protective cocoons of concrete. Without atmospheric testing we cannot increase the yield of our warheads. Knowing the limitation on those yields, the Russians easily can pour enough concrete to protect against them. When that is done, our retaliatory strikeback forces will be left threatening empty launching pads and invulnerable fortresses. That kind of threat against the Soviet homeland is hardly sufficient to deter the Kremlin. Nuclear war will become more likely, not less.

Second, our nuclear deterrent will be weakened in yet another way by a ban on atmospheric testing. To pose a credible retaliatory threat, we must be strong enough to absorb a surprise Sunday punch and then rally to devastate the attacker. The enemy's nuclear attack will create weird disturbances in all unprotected electrical circuitry. Yet to strike back convincingly, millions of electrical circuits at SAC bases, in our bombers, missiles, and Polaris submarines all must work in unison and function perfectly—beginning with transmission of the command to retaliate through every step of the massive strikeback operation, right down to triggering our warheads over enemy targets. We know a good deal about nullifying these electromagnetic disturbances, but we need to know very much more. That knowledge can be learned only from atmospheric testing.

Third, the United States starts with the sobering knowledge that, if war comes, we will be on the defensive. This means we will be using defensive nuclear weapons over our own territory and that of our allies. Dr. Edward Teller, the "father of the H-bomb," has pointed out time and again that these weapons must create little or no fallout. Otherwise we will severely hurt ourselves in our own defense. We have made a good start toward developing cleaner nuclear explosives. But we need to learn much more and, again, we need to test in the atmosphere to do the job.

Fourth, we need to test in the atmosphere to perfect the antimissile missile, the weapon that we may need desperately to preserve our nuclear deterrent. The technical problems of creating a defense against a warhead hurtling down on the United States are great. Secretary McNamara has expressed doubts that it can be done at all. However, Khrushchev, in fact, insists that the Russians have already turned the trick. "We can hit a fly in the sky," he says.

If Khrushchev's claim that his scientists have solved the technical problems is correct, then as soon as the Russian missile defense system is put into operation our nuclear deterrent will be largely nullified. Our only course of action is to develop an antimissile missile of our own. To do this, we have to test in the environment in which the weapon will be used—the atmosphere.

Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has forcefully pointed out how vital it is to test new weapons under realistic conditions. "At our

peril," he has said, "we cannot afford to repeat the tragic mistake we made with torpedoes during World Wars I and II when we had not tested torpedoes with live warheads, and its consequence was to send our submarines into the Pacific with torpedoes that would not explode."

Fifth, because the treaty will be unpolluted, the Russians could make a quantum jump militarily by the trick of surprise abrogation—clandestine preparation leading up to the sudden start of tests. Last year President Kennedy himself said that an atmospheric test ban treaty would be extremely vulnerable without provision for adequate inspection guarding against secret preparation for a surprise abrogation. Although President Kennedy has promised to keep in readiness our own plans to resume testing quickly, our program is bound to sag unless it is kept alive by at least some limited atmospheric testing. This was explained by the President in 1962, before the resumption of our own tests when he said, "we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place at an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

Sixth, there is need for the United States to continue testing because the treaty fails to rule out Soviet cheat tests either in the air or in space. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has asserted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the pact places no "faith and trust" in the Kremlin, and that it is "self-enforcing," since the United States could easily detect any atmospheric tests by the Russians. His assertions do not square with the Atomic Energy Commission's inability to classify three sets of "manifestations" from the Soviet Union early in June as nonnuclear. There is no assurance they were not very low yield or very clean air shots that released only small amounts of fission products. As to space cheating, series after series of very profitable Soviet tests in outer space could be carried on entirely without suspicion on our part.

For all these reasons, the test ban treaty helps Russia militarily. It also helps Russia psychologically and politically.

The negotiation and signing of the treaty in Moscow, together with Premier Khrushchev's role as the only participating head of state, gives Russia a credible claim to the "peacemaker" image. In addition, the treaty helps Khrushchev in his struggle with the Chinese. The negotiation tells both East and West that Khrushchev's book on "How to Succeed in Aggression Without Really Bombing" is still a best seller.

An ineffective treaty removes the pressure of world opinion for an effective one that would stop Russian progress as well as our own. Furthermore, an unpolluted treaty ratifies the Soviet "closed society" principle and forestalls future attempts to open it up.

The treaty also hints our extreme reluctance to use nuclear weapons at all, except in a final showdown with the Soviet Union. Communist and other aggressors seem to be left free to intensify conventional attacks without fear of our calculated use of nuclear arms to block them. Stepped up Red Korean action along the Korean armistice line already has cost U.S. casualties.

In addition, the treaty could be interpreted as preventing us from giving needed nuclear weapons to our allies. This comes at a time when our NATO allies seriously resent their inability to deter the Soviets independently should we refuse or become too weak to do so. Without the freedom to share

our weapons, this estrangement will deepen. The dissolution of NATO could well result. This, for years, has been one of Khrushchev's priority objectives. The nuclear test ban also comes at a time when our allies in the Far East are increasingly worried that the Red Chinese will soon get nuclear weapons.

#### APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS

Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of the test ban proposal, however, and the most difficult to argue against, is its emotional appeal. As Khrushchev knows all too well, the treaty seems to assure the worried peoples of the world that after the long years of fear everything is going to be all right. Surely the treaty must be the beginning of a thaw in the cold war. Surely, the Russians must now be ready to work for a real peace.

For Americans this line of wishful thinking could be disastrous. We could rapidly develop a false sense of security that would lead us to drop our guard. We could be emotionally pressured into more comprehensive disarmament agreements without adequate controls.

All the "first steps" sought by President Kennedy with his partial treaty could be gained through much wiser means—a simple treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union stipulating that atmospheric testing be stopped whenever certain reasonable, agreed-upon levels of fallout had been reached. These "first steps" would be substantially free from the military, psychological, and political disadvantages of the treaty at hand—which solves none of the basic conflicts between Russia and the United States. The problem of Berlin would still exist. So would Laos. So would Cuba. And there is not a shred of evidence to indicate that Americans would not continue to be killed in Korea and South Vietnam.

In such a world, the United States must keep up its nuclear guard. And the only safe way we can maintain the nuclear deterrent is by refusing to accept a Communist scheme to force us to stop testing in the atmosphere.

#### THE THREAT OF INFLATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, economists—who are opposed to Puritan ethics and advocate spend and spend while taxing less and less at a time when we are faced with an increasing national debt and with frightening deficits previously unequaled in a rising economy—are being challenged not only by learned but experienced individuals in business and industry.

Mr. President, while a majority in the Congress may describe as trivial the threat of inflation as a result of the philosophy of spend more and tax less, I point out that there are some guardians of other people's money in the field of private enterprise who do not share this economic philosophy. This is well pointed out in a letter received by me and which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE UNION CENTRAL LIFE

INSURANCE CO.,

Cincinnati, August 20, 1963.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I have been invited to join the Business Committee for Tax Reduction

in 1963. The principles advocated by this committee are said by its representatives in a letter to me to be as quoted below:

"I want to reemphasize to you the committee's belief that: (1) a reduction in individual and corporate taxes is essential to insure adequate growth and strength of our economy; (2) controversial tax revision should not be permitted to delay such reduction and, (3) economies in and prudent control of Federal expenditures are essential."

I have declined to become a member of this committee, and I have written to them as follows:

"In our opinion it would be very inflationary to reduce Federal income taxes without a completely counterbalancing reduction in the cost of the Federal Government."

"We believe the interest of the American economy and, hence, of our policyholders is best served by the position I have outlined in the paragraph above."

We feel very strongly that there should be no tax reduction without completely balancing reduction in the cost of government. We feel a deep conviction that we should urge Congress to protect the American people—including whom are more than 500,000 of our policyholders—from the inevitable impetus to inflation which would result from tax reduction without an equal reduction in Federal expenses.

In order that there may be no mistake about our sincere opinion and our fear of this impending danger, I am writing you urging your very serious consideration of this problem.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. LLOYD,

President.

#### THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, since the inception of this administration, there has been much discussion over the various pump-priming methods which have been employed to assist labor surplus areas. In my own State of Rhode Island unemployment has been the most serious domestic problem since the end of the Second World War.

It is my belief that the Kennedy administration has done more to try to alleviate this situation since it took office in January of 1961 than any previous administration.

Mr. President, it has been the concept of the New Frontier that the best way to produce immediate employment and at the same time to encourage the construction of necessary public facilities and improvements is through Federal financial assistance. Although I believe much more should be done in this direction, especially in my own State, I must say that a good beginning has been made. As a great American, Al Smith, once said "Let's look at the record."

Therefore, Mr. President, at this point I should like to ask unanimous consent to submit the enclosed table of cumulative information on the activities of the Area Redevelopment Administration, accelerated public works and manpower development and training programs in Rhode Island into the RECORD, which has been compiled by the Library of Congress and my staff.

This table is complete to this date, September 5, 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.



Location of project	Description of project	Type of Federal program	Estimated Federal contribution	Number of jobs created, or number of trainees	Estimated man-month on-site employment
Blackstone Valley	Treatment plant	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	\$1,040,000	(1)	1,056
Bristol	Sewer system	Accelerated public works	110,000	(1)	216
Cranston	Sewer facilities	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	1,200,000	(1)	(1)
Do	Osteopathic general construction	do	125,000	(1)	144
Do	Construct sewage facilities	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	323,000	(1)	330
Cumberland	Water system	do	51,000	(1)	75
East Greenwich	Public building	do	66,500	(1)	75
Lincoln	Construct town hall	do	125,000	(1)	124
Do	Water system	do	220,000	(1)	216
Mashassuck River Valley	Technical assistance for study of drainage problems and soil-bearing capacity	Area Redevelopment Administration	37,000	None	None
Narragansett	Sewage treatment plant	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	206,000	(1)	(1)
Pawtucket	Memorial Hospital addition	do	125,000	(1)	12
Do	do	Accelerated public works	1,875,000	(1)	(1)
Providence	Improve or supply access roads, streets, water and sewer to industrial park	Area redevelopment administration	\$1,071,000	1,045	(1)
Do	Rhode Island Hospital addition	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	237,000	(1)	216
Do	Roger Williams Hospital addition	do	344,000	(1)	408
Do	Sewer treatment plant	do	639,000	(1)	624
Do	Roger Williams and Miriam Hospital construction	do	287,000	(1)	(1)
Do	Modernize water supply	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	148,000	(1)	262
Do	Water facilities	do	13,000	(1)	19
Providence-Pawtucket area	Training: Bookkeeping machine operator, combination welder, sheet metal worker, typist, electronic mechanic, machine tool operator.	Area redevelopment administration	283,000	318	
Do	Training: typist, auto mechanic, machine tool operator.	do	158,000	178	
Do	Training: tabulating machine operator, console computing operator.	do	161,000	160	
Do	Training: sheet metal workers	do	19,000	20	
Do	Training: key punch operator	do	14,000	50	
Do	Training: machine operator general	do	25,000	25	
Do	Training: turret lathe operator	Manpower Development Training Act (institutional)	43,000	16	
Do	Training: auto mechanic	do	70,000	44	
Do	Training: programmer computer	do	62,000	25	
Do	Training: sheet metal worker	do	16,000	20	
Do	Training: auto body repair—metal	do	16,000	15	
Do	Training: clerk-stenographer	do	9,000	25	
Do	Training: machine operator, general	do	211,000	101	
Do	Training: custodian	Manpower Development training Act (experimentation and demonstration)	20,000	48	
Do	Training: machine operator, general	do	47,000	12	
South Kingston	Public safety building	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	57,800	(1)	72
Smithfield	Mercy Hospital addition	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	908,500	(1)	(1)
Warwick	Sewage treatment	Accelerated public works	2,148,000	(1)	2,058
Do	Water storage tank	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	76,000	(1)	75
Do	Sewage facilities	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	1,827,000	(1)	600
Do	Interceptor sewers	do	170,000	(1)	164
Do	Library	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	310,000		324
Woonsocket	Improve and extend water systems to industrial park	Area redevelopment administration	186,000	255	(1)
Do	Woonsocket Hospital addition	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	178,000	(1)	132
Do	Construct sewage facilities	Accelerated public works (HHFA-DVA)	270,000	(1)	420

<sup>1</sup> Not available.

Source: Area Redevelopment Administration; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community

facilities Administration; Department of Labor, Office of Manpower Development Training. James R. King, Economic Analyst, Economics Division, Aug. 13, 1963.

## TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in a recent issue of Chicago's American, the columnist, Andrew Tully, urged enactment of the truth-in-packaging bill. This legislation, which has been developed by Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, will be of sound benefit to the consumer. Mr. Tully, in his column, writes that "there is nothing in the bill that any honest merchant should fear," for the bill "merely provides that the American consumer be given honest weight and honest quantity for his dollar." I hope the committee will report this bill to the Senate very soon, and I think all the consumers of this country will highly commend the Senator from Michigan when they receive the protection of this much-needed legislation.

This increased press support for the truth-in-packaging bill is encouraging, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tully's column, from Chicago's American of July 25, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### WANTED: TRUTH IN PACKAGING (By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON.—If Congress would get busy, it could save the citizen some of the money he spends in supermarkets, drugstores, and similar emporiums. All it has to do is pass the truth-in-packaging bill to curb deceptive labeling and packaging practices.

The bill already has been OK'd by a subcommittee of the Senate Antitrust Committee and is now being pondered by the full committee. Even with all the work Congress has permitted to pile up, it should take time to give the buying suckers a break.

Aside from the money the bill would save, it would be a remedy for a kind of mass frustration that has come over the public in its exposure to sneaky merchandising gimmicks. Drop in any food store or pharmacy these days to make a single purchase, and you are caught up in a bewildering assortment that makes it impossible to discover which item is the best buy.

### PINT A "GIANT HALF QUART"

There are "full" quarts, "jumbo" quarts, and "giant" quarts. No longer is there the

simple pint—it has been merchandised into the "giant half quart." Huge packages of dry cereal open to reveal a couple of inches at the top is pure air. Bread is pimped with air holes, and ice cream is packed in such a way that the customer is short-weighted. Labels shriek that the price of an item is "4 cents off" the regular price, but nobody can find out what the regular price is.

A parade of witnesses have testified during the last 2 years concerning these sleazy merchandising tricks, and legislative voices deplored the situation. Particular attention was paid to the fine print on certain packages, which when translated often contradicted the label's promises as to weights, quantities, and sizes. Odd-sized packages were found to cheat on quantity, and the prettier the container was the more the consumer had to pay for what was in it.

### CALLS FOR STANDARDIZATION

The truth-in-packaging bill would at least be a start toward ending this thievery. It would standardize the contents of small, medium, and large packages, and demand the truth on the labels of "giant" and "imperial" containers. It would halt the deceptive cents-off-regular-price gimmick, provide that weights and contents be printed in

clear type, and insist that the merchandiser state what is meant by the claim that a given package serves "X" number of persons.

Producers always set up a whine when the Government steps in to try to regulate them, and there have been the customary bleats about this bill. It has been attacked as both confiscatory and un-American. But the fact is there is nothing in the bill that any honest merchant should fear. It merely provides that the American consumer be given honest weight and honest quality for his dollars. This may be an eccentric approach in these days, but it falls somewhat short of treason.

#### LACK OF ANY ADMINISTRATION POLICY IN REGARD TO VIETNAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in Tuesday's issue of the Washington Evening Star appeared an editorial in which the lack of any administration policy in regard to Vietnam is pointed out.

This editorial emphasizes once again the reluctance of the Kennedy administration to face up to a major decision at the appropriate time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "No Policy in Vietnam," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 3, 1963]  
NO POLICY IN VIETNAM

However one may choose to interpret the President's comments on Vietnam in his televised CBS interview, they hardly add up to anything that can be called a policy. If Mr. Kennedy's points were set down, they would run something like this:

1. The repressions against the Buddhists were very unwise. We take this to mean

that President Diem should not have struck back in the face of a Buddhist political attempt to overthrow his government.

2. The war in Vietnam cannot be won without popular support.

3. The Diem government might regain the support of the people with changes in policy (what changes?) and perhaps with changes in personnel. This last presumably refers to President Diem's brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, tough-minded head of the secret police.

4. For the United States to withdraw its support in the war against the Communist Vietcong would be a great mistake.

Finally, the interviewer, Walter Cronkite, got down to what used to be called the \$64 question. "Hasn't every indication from Saigon been that President Diem has no intention of changing his pattern?"

The President didn't answer this one. Instead, he took refuge in a wordy diversion which was in no sense a response to the most pertinent question in the interview.

All of which points to this conclusion: The war in Vietnam, which we will continue to support, will be lost unless the Diem government changes, and the President doesn't know or won't say whether Diem will change or not. Meanwhile, our Government persists in statements which tend to undermine the Diem regime without raising up any prospective successor.

Whatever this may be, it is not entitled to be called a policy. The more the administration explains what we are doing in Vietnam, the less sense it makes.

#### DUTIES ON JAPANESE FISHERY IMPORTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have previously addressed the Senate with reference to S. 1988, the bill introduced by me on August 6 which provides enforcement procedures and penalties which our Government may use in protecting the integrity of our territorial

waters and our claims of fishery resources of the Continental Shelf.

At the time of the presentation of the bill newspapers reported that its introduction has been viewed in Tokyo as "a manifestation of unfriendly sentiment against Japanese fishermen." This report concerned me greatly.

So it was that I was moved to communicate with the Ambassador from Japan, His Excellency, Ryuji Takeuchi. The text of my letter to him has previously been made a matter of record.

On August 28, Ambassador Takeuchi replied and it is with the greatest pleasure I present the text of his response:

MY DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I have received your letter of August 13 and wish to state in reply that I am now told by our authorities in Tokyo that no Japanese official has made a comment on your proposed bill such as the one reported by AP dispatches. You can rest assured that the Japanese authorities in Tokyo desire to maintain most cordial relations with your country on fishery questions as well as on all other matters.

Sincerely yours,

RYUJI TAKEUCHI,  
Ambassador of Japan.

I was pleased to read that the adverse comments reported from Japan have no basis in fact. True, we have had cordial relations in general with Japan. This is seen most clearly in the fact that throughout the years Japan has had in America a flourishing market for its fishery products. Its exports in 1962 were in excess of \$100 million. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table indicating as clearly as anything can the importance of the U.S. market to the fishing industry of Japan.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Imports of fishery products from Japan by commodity description, 1962

Item	Unit	Quantity	Value <sup>1</sup>	Tariff July 1, 1934 <sup>2</sup>	1963 tariff
<b>EDIBLE PRODUCTS</b>					
Frog legs, fresh, chilled, or frozen		1,322,863	\$1,354,647	10 percent ad valorem	5 percent.
Frog legs, prepared or preserved		5,738	7,638	20 percent ad valorem	12 percent.
Fresh water trout, not elsewhere included, fresh and frozen		1,845,919	747,447	1 cent per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Fresh water n.e.s. and blue pike, fresh or frozen		800	131	do	Do.
Eels, fresh or frozen		800	812	do	Do.
Salmon, fresh or frozen		165,753	113,860	2 cents per pound	Do.
Cod, haddock, hake, pollock, and cusk, fresh or frozen		318,500	51,385	1 cent per pound	Do.
Halibut, fresh or frozen <sup>3</sup>		394,164	107,260	2 cents per pound	Do.
Mackerel, frozen		447,695	73,390	do	0.75 cent per pound.
Sturgeon, fresh or frozen		130,620	47,399	1 cent per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Swordfish, frozen		59,316	21,729	2 cents per pound	0.75 cent per pound.
Shad, fresh or frozen		200	290	1 cent per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Fish, n.e.s., fresh or frozen		1,761,804	338,476	do	1 cent per pound.
Smelts, fresh or frozen		390,886	74,348	Free	Free.
Albacore, whole, fresh or frozen, not cooked		52,074,117	9,346,616	do	Do.
Albacore, n.e.s., fresh or frozen, not cooked		2,464,777	412,254	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., whole, fresh or frozen, not cooked		4,057,936	622,757	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., gilled and gutted, fresh or frozen, not cooked		66,863,020	11,392,298	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., filleted, fresh or frozen, not cooked		10,732,820	1,897,632	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., gilled and gutted, heads, tails removed		10,772,880	1,658,272	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., n.e.s., fresh or frozen, not cooked		963,656	101,857	do	Do.
Skipjack tuna, fresh or frozen, not cooked		1,291,618	141,455	do	Do.
Tuna, not elsewhere specified, fresh or frozen, not cooked		1,508,740	211,371	do	Do.
Cod, filleted, fresh or frozen		21,630	4,047	2½ cents per pound	1.875 cents per pound and 2½ cents per pound. <sup>4</sup>
Swordfish, filleted, fresh or frozen		18,425,981	6,232,416	do	1.5 cents per pound. <sup>5</sup>
Halibut and salmon, filleted, fresh or frozen		4,335,213	1,722,799	do	Do.
Yellow pike filleted, fresh or frozen		25,000	4,623	do	Do.
Fresh water fish except yellow pike, filleted, fresh or frozen		10,000	3,230	do	Do.
Flounders, filleted, fresh, or frozen		23,148	10,338	do	Do.
Wolf fish, filleted, fresh, or frozen		8,700	2,697	do	1 cent per pound.
Fish, filleted, boned, etc., fresh or frozen		3,903,804	1,161,359	do	1.5 cents per pound.
Cod, haddock, etc., dried and unsalted		2,045	750	do	0.2 cent per pound.
Shark fins, dried and unsalted		56,611	64,794	1½ cents per pound	0.53 cent per pound.
Fish, n.e.s., dried and unsalted		115,796	82,970	do	0.3125 cent per pound.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 18, not over 23 cents per pound		487	108	30 percent	20 percent.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 23, not over 30 cents per pound		5,934	2,220	do	15 percent.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 30 cents per pound, smoked		4,960	2,188	do	12.5 percent.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 30 cents per pound		3,774	990	do	15 percent.

See footnotes at end of table.



## Imports of fishery products from Japan by commodity description, 1962—Continued

Item	Unit	Quantity	Value <sup>1</sup>	Tariff July 1, 1934 <sup>2</sup>	1963 tariff
<b>EDIBLE PRODUCTS—continued</b>					
Sardines in oil, skinned or boned—over 30 cents per pound		2, 100	\$1, 300	30 percent	24 percent.
Anchovies in oil, valued over 9 cents per pound		397	163	do.	12 percent.
White meat tuna fish in oil, canned		206, 118	91, 113	45 percent	35 percent.
Other tuna fish in oil, canned		32, 053	13, 335	do.	Do.
Bonito and yellowtail in oil, valued over 9 cents per pound		36, 731	12, 522	30 percent	15 percent.
Smoked pollock in oil, valued at over 9 cents per pound		12, 039	6, 653	do.	Do.
Fish in oil, n.e.s., over 9 cents per pound		390, 223	181, 415	do.	25.5 percent.
Salmon, not in oil, in airtight containers		4, 422, 325	2, 237, 655	25 percent	15 percent ad valorem.
Canned albacore in brine		26, 081, 906	12, 053, 459	do.	12.5 percent. <sup>3</sup>
Canned tuna in brine, n.e.s.		21, 032, 909	7, 912, 761	do.	Do. <sup>3</sup>
Fish cakes, balls, and pudding, not in oil, airtight		358, 516	125, 955	do.	3 percent.
Herring, smoked or kippered or in tomato sauce		998, 010	180, 483	do.	6.25 percent. <sup>3</sup>
Bonito in brine, in airtight containers		63, 499	24, 119	do.	12.5 percent. <sup>3</sup>
Fish, n.e.s., in airtight containers		158, 708	113, 164	do.	Do. <sup>3</sup>
Salmon, pickled or salted		3, 185	3, 014	25 percent ad valorem	8.5 percent.
Cod, haddock, etc., pickled, salted, skinned or boned		7, 825	1, 594	2 cents per pound	0.75 cent per pound.
Herring, pickled or salted, in containers, not over 10 pounds, net		30	118	1 cent per pound	0.14 cent per pound. <sup>3</sup>
Herring, pickled or salted, in containers, over 10 pounds net		250	213	do.	0.1 cent per pound. <sup>3</sup>
Mackerel, pickled or salted, bulk or containers, over 15 pounds		6, 500	989	do.	0.2 cent per pound.
Fish, pickled, salted, n.s.p.f., bulk or containers, over 15 pounds		118, 759	54, 547	1¼ cents per pound	1¼ cents per pound.
Fish, pickled, salted, n.s.p.f., in containers, not over 15 pounds		1, 500	801	25 percent ad valorem	25 percent.
Salmon, smoked or kippered, n.e.s.		122	420	do.	10 percent.
Cod, etc., filleted, smoked or kippered		288	110	3 cents per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Fish, smoked or kippered, n.s.p.f.		600	200	25 percent ad valorem	25 percent.
Fish, n.e.s., in containers, not over 15 pounds		26, 596	23, 995	do.	12.5 percent. <sup>3</sup>
Albacore, loins, and disks, prepared, n.e.s., bulk or containers, not over 15 pounds		1, 630, 638	669, 423	1¼ cents per pound	1 cent per pound.
Tuna, loins and disks, n.e.s., prepared, bulk or containers, not over 15 pounds		8, 566, 867	3, 117, 844	1¼ cents per pound	1 cent per pound.
Frozen blocks or slabs, uncooked fish bits, etc.		34, 800	5, 740	do.	Do.
Other prepared or preserved fish		277, 862	152, 272	do.	Do.
Fish paste and fish sauce		22, 223	14, 510	30 percent	8 percent.
Fish roe, n.s.p.f., not boiled		25, 517	56, 089	20 cents per pound	4 cents per pound.
Fish roe, n.e.s., for food, boiled, in airtight containers		2, 883	4, 108	30 percent	5.5 percent.
Crabmeat, etc., fresh or frozen		206, 300	188, 634	15 percent	15 percent.
Crabmeat, etc., prepared in airtight containers		3, 441, 854	4, 635, 347	do.	22.5 percent.
Oysters, etc., in airtight containers		2, 777, 969	916, 272	8 cents per pound	6 cents per pound.
Oysters, smoked, in airtight containers		1, 402, 155	669, 265	do.	4.5 cents per pound.
Other oysters, etc., in airtight containers		3, 109, 862	825, 326	do.	6 cents per pound.
Razor clams, canned		1, 428	631	23 percent	7.5 percent.
Clams, n.e.s.		1, 354, 180	809, 241	Free	Free.
Clam chowder and clam juice and combinations		5, 441	5, 009	35 percent <sup>4</sup>	17.5 percent. <sup>4</sup>
Rock lobster tails		299, 647	338, 160	Free	Free.
Other fresh or frozen lobsters		47, 144	48, 939	do.	Do.
Lobsters, canned		914	1, 562	do.	Do.
Turtles		20	330	do.	Do.
Clams, quahogs, not in airtight containers		358, 083	76, 136	do.	Do.
Shrimps and prawns		1, 468, 230	875, 366	do.	Do.
Headless shrimp, fresh or frozen		91, 369	63, 938	do.	Do.
Peeled and deveined shrimp, frozen		1, 281, 491	848, 229	do.	Do.
Shrimp and prawns, n.e.s.		1, 080, 953	951, 313	do.	Do.
Scallops, fresh, frozen, and prepared		82, 576	96, 353	do.	Do.
Oysters fresh or frozen, not in airtight containers		94, 228	53, 175	do.	Do.
Oysters, n.e.s., not in airtight containers		1, 542, 801	162, 477	do.	Do.
Abalone		105, 313	171, 897	do.	Do.
Shellfish, n.s.p.f.		2, 669, 865	695, 434	do.	Do.
Shellfish pastes and sauces, n.s.p.f.		638	528	do.	Do.
Total, edible		270, 461, 675	77, 512, 899		
<b>NONEDIBLE PRODUCTS</b>					
Whale oil, sperm, refined or processed	Gallon	5, 638	4, 605	1.87 cents per pound	0.47 cent per pound.
Cod liver oil	do.	355, 555	433, 049	Free	Free.
Kelp	Pound	131, 870	85, 356	do.	Do.
Coral, marine, uncut and unmanufactured	do.	2, 385	19, 280	do.	Do.
Fish scrap except fertilizer	Short ton	15	4, 800	do.	Do.
Whale bone, unmanufactured	do.		318	do.	5 percent.
Goldfish and other aquarian fish, n.e.s.	do.		17, 002	do.	Free.
Fish, inedible, n.e.s.	do.		2, 843, 549	do.	Do.
Shells, mother of pearl and trocus, unmanufactured	Pound	299, 406	164, 184	do.	Do.
Shells, n.s.p.f., unmanufactured	do.	181, 618	20, 419	do.	Do.
Fish solubles	Short ton	338	11, 578	do.	Do.
Halibut liver oil, advanced	Pound	3, 947	5, 590	10 percent plus 3 cents per pound.	5 percent.
Fish oils and fish liver oils, n.e.s., advanced	do.	232, 897	914, 193	do.	Do.
Agar-Agar	do.	140, 860	244, 944	25 percent	15 percent.
Spermaceti wax	do.	29, 880	4, 747	3.5 cents per pound	2.5 cents per pound.
Pearl essence	do.	38, 099	241, 072	25 percent	9 percent.
Buttons, fresh water, pearl or shell	Gross lines	1, 536, 723		1.75 cents plus 25 percent	1.75 cents plus 25 percent.
Buttons, ocean pearl shell	do.	3, 434, 053		do.	Do.
Natural pearls and parts			363, 619	10 percent	3 percent.
Cultured pearls and parts			17, 934, 159	do.	5 percent.
Reptile and sharkskin, leather, n.e.s.			17, 781	25 percent	10 percent.
Luggage, leather, fitted with travel sets, etc.			59, 960	35 percent	Do.
Luggage, reptile, not fitted			7, 685	do.	17.5 percent.
Purses, billfolds, etc., leather, reptile			1, 252	do.	14 percent.
Leather manufactures, n.e.s., reptile			7, 154	do.	Do.
Shells, etc., cut, engraved, ornamented or otherwise manufactured			25, 427	do.	17.5 percent.
Manufactures of shell and mother-of-pearl			173, 805	do.	Do.
Moss, sea grass, etc., dyed, manufactured, n.s.p.f.			228, 778	10 percent	22 percent.
Whale oil, sperm, crude	Gallon	5, 206, 777	3, 563, 470	0.67 cent per pound	0.065 cent per pound.
Total, nonedible			27, 397, 771		
Grand total			104, 910, 670		

<sup>1</sup> The dollar value is defined generally as the market value in the foreign country, excluding U.S. import duties, ocean freight, and marine insurance. Figures not checked by Tariff Commission. The above figures do not include 66,082,000 pounds of tuna received from the Canal Zone, Trinidad, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Ghana, Canary Islands, Ivory Coast, and the Fiji Islands. It is understood that these imports consist entirely or almost entirely of tuna landed in these countries by Japanese fishing vessels or shipment to the United States.

<sup>2</sup> Cuban rate not shown.

<sup>3</sup> In act correspondence with tariff schedule.

<sup>4</sup> On American selling price. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Prepared by Branch of Statistics, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Aug. 20, 1963.

Mr. BARTLETT. It should be pointed out that this enormous value of fishery exports to the United States came about in some degree because of the fact the duties imposed have been substantially reduced during recent years. The table clearly indicates that the United States duty on Japanese fishery imports have dropped substantially since 1934. These figures, I believe, will be of interest to all who are concerned with our relations with Japan.

#### THE "FIRST LADY" WALTZ

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there has been no limit to the tributes paid to our beloved first lady, Mrs. John F. Kennedy. Among those tributes is one that I consider particularly fitting—the dedication of a waltz in her honor.

An article concerning the "First Lady Waltz" and its composer, Jimmy McHugh, appeared in the July 27 issue of the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### IT'S THE "FIRST LADY" WALTZ

Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy will be 34 tomorrow. As she rests at Hyannis on Cape Cod, she will receive many gifts. One of the most lasting will be a delightful song, "The First Lady Waltz," composed by Jimmy McHugh with lyrics by Ned Washington.

McHugh, the alltime hit composer, has produced such memorable tunes as "I Can't Give You Anything But Love, Baby," "Sunny Side of the Street," "It's a Most Unusual Day," "South American Way," and "Coming in on a Wing and a Prayer."

The song has been performed publicly twice—once by the U.S. Navy Band at the White House correspondents dinner for President Kennedy and later at the American Society of Artists and Composers gang dinner at the Press Club here.

Between songs, McHugh has occupied himself as Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce president, board member of ASCAP, sponsor of amateur swimming championships, and head of the Jimmy McHugh Polio Foundation. He has scored the music for many musical revues and motion pictures.

McHugh also is a patron of classical music, perpetuating an appreciation which developed from his first job after leaving college—office boy at the Boston Opera House.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA AT ANNUAL ORCHARD PICNIC

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on last Saturday, August 31, our esteemed colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], as has long been his custom, entertained his neighbors and many friends at his Berryville home, with his 41st annual orchard picnic. As has been his practice on those occasions he addressed this splendid gathering of neighbors and friends, giving them a "Byrd's-eye view" of "What can be seen from Washington."

Mr. President, Senator Byrd's remarks in that address are and should be of great interest—not only to all of us and to all other officials and servants of the Federal Government, but they should be read and pondered by all citizens of this

country. They merit the profound thought and concern of all of us.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our first picnic was in 1923. This is the 41st. If veterans of all of them are here, I am pleased. If so, you know that since 1933—when the people of Virginia sent me to the Senate—it has been my custom to give you a "Byrd's-eye-view" of what can be seen from Washington.

The text of the "Byrd's-eye-view" today lies in 17 famous words. I repeat them on this warm August day in Virginia. Spoken from the east portico of the Capitol of the United States on a cold day in January 1961, they were heard and translated the world over. Those words were: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

These were the challenging words of the President of the United States closing his inaugural address on January 20, 2 years and 7 months ago. Who has done what for whom in these past 31 months? Take a look at the record, and draw your own conclusions. You will find:

Presidential communications to Congress have approved some 200 programs involving increased Federal obligations of public money and credit. Federal officials have said expenditures will exceed \$100 billion next year. At the 1961 picnic we predicted a \$100 billion budget in 4 years.

Pressure continues on increasing Federal expenditures for housing, urban renewal, public assistance, public education, health, water resources, river basin development, etc. Spending is increasing for space, moon and ocean exploration, depressed area redevelopment, retraining the jobless, etc. (Going to the moon is estimated to cost \$40 billion.)

More Federal spending programs are being formed for surface and mass transportation, acquisition and development of open spaces, and there are more and new Federal paternalistic programs for grants to States and payments to individuals and institutions for public assistance, health, agriculture, higher education, and other things that people should do for themselves.

Virtually no area of domestic-civilian activity by the Federal Government has been overlooked in Presidential message proposals for increased spending. Expansion of foreign aid programs, including the foreign (and new domestic) Peace Corps, the military buildup and civil defense are in addition.

Then we must add in vast increases in trust fund expenditures, outside of the regular budget, for unemployment, health insurance for the aged, social security recipients, and continuing increases for highways—both the interstate and the AEC systems. And so the administration's proposals go—on and on.

Some of these proposals might be desirable, if we were ready, willing, and able to pay for them, but the record shows that we are not, and the administration admits it. In effect, all of these new expenditures increase the public debt in a deficit financing situation. The figures in the official records are clear. For proof, all we have to do is look at what we have been doing to our fiscal condition.

In the fiscal year ended on June 30 before those famous words were uttered by the President, there had been a Federal surplus of \$1.2 billion. There has been a Federal deficit in each fiscal year since January 20, 1961, and in the past 2 years it has totaled \$6½ billion a year. This year it will be that high again, or higher, depending on the outcome of tax cut proposals.

In the fiscal year ended June 30 before those famous words were said, the Federal debt totaled \$286.1 billion. Now it totals upward of \$305 billion—an increase of nearly \$19 billion. In 3 years interest on the debt

has been increased by \$1 billion a year, or 9.2 percent.

To take care of its activities, the Federal Government in the past 2½ years has added some 166,000 civilian employees and increased the civilian payroll by \$1.7 billion a year. The civilian payroll is now running at an annual rate of \$15½ billion or more; and there are more than 2.5 million civilians on the rolls.

And the great bulk of the increase—both in number of civilian employees, and in payroll costs, has not been in the military departments; it has been in civilian agencies. These figures continue to go up, and they do not include, of course, those employed as uniformed personnel in the Armed Forces.

"Ask not what your country can do for you," the President said, "ask what you can do for your country." That question was directed not only to those on the Federal payrolls, but to all of the 189 million people who now make up the population of the United States.

And recipients of Federal programs and their dependents, plus those on Federal civilian and military payrolls and their families, may well add up to half the population of the United States—all, consciously or not, subject to varying degrees of Federal control exercised by bureaus in Washington.

The arm of the Federal Government these days has a long reach, and no one is escaping the force of its centralized power. In earlier years Federal might was developed more subtly; now it grabs control openly. The Federal Government at the moment is seeking control over voting laws, State legislatures, schools, and business.

When I came to the Senate there were only two major so-called Federal-State aid programs—for land grant colleges and roads. There was no Federal subsidy of individuals, localities, States, business, agriculture, etc. These are the Federal programs which crack our fortitude and break down our system of government.

Now there are 110 programs through which the Federal Government is spending \$10½ billion a year in grants and other domestic aid, with Federal strings of control attached. There are still more programs for Federal loans, insurance, guarantee of private housing mortgages, etc., also with Federal control strings attached.

These subsidy controls have been extended into business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, private and public institutions, and individuals. Name an area of endeavor, and there is probably a Federal subsidy to go with it.

These are marks of weakness; not of strength. And Federal controls are becoming more binding every day. First it was exercised through imposition of so-called Federal standards tied to the programs. Then it was broadened to force the payment of Federal wage rates, such as those established under the Davis-Bacon Act.

Now the control is being imposed through Executive and administrative order from Washington, with or without statutory authority. For example, there was the recent Executive order fixing by decree conditions of employment in business operations having Government contracts.

Another recent order authorized the withholding of Federal insurance and guarantees of individual private mortgages which do not conform to Federal ideas as to how residential neighborhoods should be integrated. These are some of the things the Government is doing for you.

Think over the Federal control in your life, and the lives of your children, and your friends. You are almost certain to conclude—on the basis of your own experience—that the Federal Government is seeking to be all powerful, and that we, our localities, and our States are becoming mere puppets.



Consider the Executive crackdown on the steel industry last year, when the Central Government made unprecedented use of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal grand jury, and threats to withdraw and withhold Federal contracts from companies which dared not to conform to administration price control.

The President last year went so far as to recommend that he should assume the power of the purse. He actually proposed that he be authorized to cut taxes by Executive order, and spend money on projects for which no appropriations had been made.

Both of these powers would have undermined the Constitution which prohibits expenditures except "in consequence of appropriations made by law," and fixes the taxing power of the Government solely in the legislative branch. Congress, fortunately, defeated the proposals, but they are still being demanded.

Now the power grabbers in Washington want to go far beyond anything yet proposed. As a part of the pending civil rights program they want to make it illegal, under Federal statute, for business men, or women—in small business or large—to choose the people with whom they want to do business.

There are outstanding executive, administrative, and military orders which threaten that the Secretary of Defense may order military base commanders to declare "off limits" business establishments which choose among the military personnel they wish to serve.

We still have before us the administration's proposal to extend Federal control over the medical care of the aged people of the country. That is quiet this year. But the pressure will be on again next year with the presidential election coming up.

Power feeds on power. And the Warren Court has equaled, if not exceeded, the executive branch in usurping and centralizing power in the Federal Government. It has handed down two decisions telling schoolchildren when and where to pray.

Decisions by the Federal Supreme Court have been usurping more and more power for years. They have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded State sovereignty, interfered with executive authority, and assumed legislative powers.

The Warren Court is now undertaking to dictate and influence the formation of political districts within States from which members of State legislatures are elected. Nothing could be further outside Federal jurisdiction.

Gerrymander by the Federal judiciary is something new and dangerous in our form of government. It could be used to destroy the effectiveness of our two-party system, and the safeguards against usurpation of power.

And in the face of all of this, Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, in a speech before the American Bar Association, August 12, told the Nation's lawyers and judges they should "put aside discredited theories of the constitutional law" and support the Warren Court.

Centralization of power makes it easy for pressure groups to concentrate their demands on the few in Washington who exercise authority. And, by the same token, it makes it easy for the few in authority to exercise vast power over the many.

Our strength is being sapped by paternalism of Federal bureaucracy grown too big; usurpation of power by the Federal Supreme Court grown too mighty; and force of pressure groups grown too arrogant. They are undermining our system, changing our attitudes, and hobbling our will for freedom.

Hope for the future—built on confidence—is the stimulating force for sound progress. But confidence is not stimulated by expanding Federal domination and control, or judicial usurpation of power, or excessive Federal spending; and we are feeling the oppression of all three.

There are deficits everywhere we look. The United Nations has a deficit of more than \$120 million, and we will pay most of it. NATO has a deficit with only the United States and Canada fully meeting prescribed goals. There is a balance-of-payments deficit under which foreigners have taken two-thirds of our free gold. And there are planned deficits in the regular Federal budget.

We have bought half of the U.N. bonds. We are not demanding that our allies meet their NATO goals. The administration seems incapable of stopping the extremely dangerous outflow of gold, and gold backs our money. The management of our fiscal affairs is thoroughly irresponsible. We have tried too long to be Santa Claus, banker, and policeman for the free world.

Government economists say balancing the budget is still a goal; but to balance it any time soon would make us poor because there would be no Federal deficit to make us rich. And to make us richer faster, they want the Government to create bigger deficits by spending more and cutting taxes at the same time.

These ideas don't sound like men looking for New Frontiers. They sound like Rip Van Winkle. These economists must have been taking a long nap. For years at these prices we have been talking about the foolishness of trying to spend the country rich. We know from experience, our tax bills, and our debt, that it doesn't work.

But the new crop of economists are still doing business at the same old stand, just as if they had discovered a shortcut to the promised land. And, some of the things for which the Government is spending money are remarkable. You can see plenty of horrible examples, if you look around. You would be surprised at how many people write to me about expenditures we could do without.

I had a letter not long ago from a lady in Arlington County. The Government had sent her 17-year-old daughter a fancy greeting card. It said: "The U.S. Army extends congratulations on the occasion of your high school graduation and wishes you continued success in all of your future endeavors."

The card was personally signed—with pen and ink—by "Your U.S. Army recruiter, M. Sgt. Burton L. Poole."

Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower advised me that last spring the Army had sent a million of these cards to high school graduates all over the country, regardless of sex or age. The Air Force had sent a half million. The cost was charged to Army and Air Force "Maintenance and operation."

Then there was the authenticated report that the Federal Aviation Agency used taxpayers' money to discover that the "average man's posterior covers 179.4 square inches, and exerts average pressure of 0.92 pound per square inch."

I am advised that the official title of the project was "An Analysis of the Sitting Areas and Pressures of Man," and that the findings were made available to the public, and other Government agencies through the Science Foundation Exchange but no record of the users has been kept.

I have an extensive file of correspondence on the project of Dr. Harry P. Harlow, of the University of Wisconsin, who is studying the "Nature and Development of the Affectional Relationship of the Infant Monkey and his Mother."

At last report, the Budget Director confirmed that the National Institute of Mental Health had given Dr. Harlow two grants totaling more than a million and six-hundred thousand dollars, and the indications were that the study was to go on and on.

It is difficult to be critical of health research, but it seems to me that much more

care should be exercised in the expenditure of taxpayers' money, even in this important area.

Listen to another Institute of Mental Health project, as described by the Comptroller General of the United States: it was a project for the study of "The Social Role of Aging Wild Horses." The Comptroller General said taxpayers' money for this purpose was granted to the University of Colorado, for investigation.

The project was to extend previous research on the social behavior of elk, buffalo, and moose herds. The study was approved on the grounds that it appeared to be "an imaginative attempt to gather unusual information, which might yield a unique, and significant, contribution to problems of comparative behavior in man."

The Presidency of the United States is a high office, and Members of Congress almost invariably grant personal requests by the President. On July 9, Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, announced the subcommittee approved a request, made by personal letter from the President, for two new twin-jet helicopters. The cost was \$1,125,000 each.

The two new machines were to replace two single engine helicopters in the White House fleet. And that is a fleet which has grown from 4 to 10 machines in 2½ years, and all of these craft are 10-seaters. They represent an investment of \$15 million, with maintenance costing a half million dollars a year. A \$4.3 million heliport is being planned.

The President is a busy man, and he must be able to move and act quickly; and I certainly do not begrudge him any recreation he is able to find. But consider the land, sea, and air transport available to the White House. These are the 10 helicopters, the President's private \$8 million fan-jet Boeing 707-320 airplane, 3 Boeing 707's assigned to the White House by the Air Force, 1 Air Force Douglas DC-6B for airports that can't take jets, a 21-foot Lincoln Continental automobile, and 3 other family cars, in addition to Secret Service vehicles, and the regular White House fleet, 2 yachts, another yacht available from the Navy, and a racing yawl supplied through the Coast Guard.

Maybe all of this is necessary; but somehow or another it seems to me that the President could set an example by getting along with a little less.

And for us farmers, let's not overlook the fact that two Agriculture Department chemists—Martin Jacobson and Morton Beroza—recently reported discovering that a male gypsy moth on the wing can spot the presence of a receptive, grounded, female gypsy moth as far as a quarter of a mile away—downwind.

Reports of this discovery said the gypsy moth and the silkworm moth sex lure "are the only two insect attractants" that scientists to date have been able to "identify chemically, and duplicate" but they are working hard on the cockroach.

I could continue listing horrible examples of places the Federal Government has been spending money that need not be spent, or had better not be spent. I haven't even mentioned foreign-aid examples, which top them all. For instance, there were: The \$14 million drought relief program that didn't relieve; the \$2 million road that didn't go anywhere; and the \$125,000 irrigation project that didn't irrigate.

All of these were in Peru. Think over the fact that U.S. foreign aid has totaled more than \$100 billion, and gone to more than 100 countries in addition to Peru. I don't go through this kind of rollcall to be facetious. I am simply trying to say Federal expenditures could and should be reduced.

If they were reduced substantially, I would be among the first to give serious consideration to reducing taxes. Taxes are too high, and they should be cut. But let me remind all who will listen, that there is only one reason for Federal taxes. And that reason is to meet Federal expenditures.

And we have collected enough Federal taxes to meet Federal expenditures in only 6 of the last 33 years. Now the administration says it is planning to spend more than we collect in revenue for years to come. So far as I can recall, no other administration in the history of this country has deliberately planned peacetime deficits.

To do this, it is proposing that we should reduce taxes for 2 years straight, spend more and more, disregard deficits, and push the debt higher and higher. Everything imaginable has been claimed for the tax cut which the administration has proposed, and all sorts of dire results are predicted if the proposed tax reductions are not enacted.

When we look the situation squarely in the face, we see the facts of life. And the Federal fiscal facts of life are that the national debt is already more than \$300 billion, and under the administration's recommendations every dollar of the tax cut it proposes would be added to the debt we already owe.

I predict the Federal debt will reach \$325 billion within 3 years if the tax reduction bill is passed. Interest on the debt alone is budgeted at \$10 billion—that is \$1 out of every \$8.50 you pay in taxes—and it is going higher. And we know that 4-percent interest compounded semiannually doubles the principal in 17½ years.

Now let's bring this proposed tax reduction down to what it really means in dollars and cents to you and me, as taxpayers. If you take the tax rate schedule now proposed in the House Ways and Means Committee, you find that: In the first fiscal year the average reduction for individual taxpayers would be 8 cents a day. That would be 56 cents a week, \$2.50 a month, or \$30 a year. In the second year the reduction might rise to an average of 24 cents a day. And that wouldn't buy a package of cigarettes in many places.

And as to taxes on corporations: corporations with tax liability in excess of \$100,000 (which pay 80 percent of the Federal corporate taxes) would be required actually to increase their cash payments in the first fiscal year under a scheme to accelerate their remittances. In the second year the corporate tax reduction would total only about \$500 million.

That, my friends, is the way the administration's tax reduction proposals average out in terms of the bill as it is now drafted by the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives.

How much the Government will help you and the country with such a tax cut is questionable, but what it will do to the Nation's fiscal position is clear. The debt will go up \$1 for every dollar taxes are cut for the foreseeable future.

Eliminate unnecessary Federal expenditures, and constructive tax reduction is sure to follow. As we stand now, tax reduction would be irresponsible and dangerous. People generally know this, and there is a feeling of reluctance about this proposal in the air.

Since this present 88th Congress was convened last January some 11,800 bills and resolutions have been introduced in the House and Senate. To date (through August 28) 103 have been passed. That's less than one in a hundred, less than 1 percent.

And we would be better off if many of those had not been passed. Percentage-wise I think this record to date would please Thomas Jefferson, who held that the least governed are the best governed.

It should be noted that the railroad legislation passed this week was one of the bills

enacted. It prevented a nationwide strike which would have done untold damage. It was an action that had to be taken and it was.

If little legislation has been enacted to date, there are reasons why Congress is moving slowly. Think over some of the legislation the administration is still pressing the Congress to pass, and you find yourself pondering questions like these:

Would you expect the Soviets to violate the proposed treaty banning tests of nuclear weapons in outer space, in the atmosphere, and under water, if it were entered into?

Do you think our great desire for peace is best served by ratification of the so-called nuclear test ban treaty by the United States?

Do you favor Federal legislation now pending in Congress which would deny to those engaged in hotel, motel, restaurant, soda fountain, amusement, and all retail business the right to choose their clientele on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin?

Do you think the Federal Government should live within its revenue income except in periods of national emergency?

Do you favor legislation, as the President proposes, reducing Federal taxes—with planned deficits—and increasing the Federal debt in the amount of the tax reduction?

Would you favor reduction in Federal expenditures to compensate for tax reduction?

If you favor reduction in Federal expenditures for tax reduction or for any other purpose, do you think the reductions should be made in: Foreign aid; military activities; domestic-civilian programs; generally, in all categories?

Do you favor Federal aid programs which subsidize States, localities, individuals, business, housing, agriculture, education, health (including hospital construction), etc.? There are still some of these programs before Congress, such as the Federal aid to education bill.

If you favor Federal-aid programs, do you think the Federal Government should exercise substantial control over the programs through the imposition of standards, requirements, wage rates, civil rights decrees, etc.?

What fiscal discipline and other action is needed to stop the dangerous foreign drain on our gold reserves, and how much longer can we stand these continual withdrawals?

How should we answer these questions—each of us, in Congress, and out—if we faithfully are to meet the President's challenge: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country?"

#### COLUMBUS DAY SHOULD BE A LEGAL HOLIDAY IN THE UNITED STATES—SENATE BILL 108 SHOULD BE PASSED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, even as Columbus once faced the vast unknown horizons of the Atlantic, the United States is today confronted by the seemingly unbounded complexities of national and international affairs. We still face uncharted seas of diplomacy, amid the manmade tempests of oppression, subversion, and duplicity. We oppose the encroachments of communism, and seek to illuminate its fallacies in much the same manner as that in which Columbus dispelled the fears of a doubting and superstition-bound world.

We navigate troubled waters in domestic affairs, as well, where we are working to repel the tides of unemployment, to hasten the conquest of disease, and to bring about the banishment of ignorance. Much remains to be done in the rehabilitation of the handicapped,

in the relief of the destitute, and in bringing security to the aged.

As never in our history, the memory and meaning of Christopher Columbus inspire us to renewed dedication and purpose as we strive to meet these challenges at home and abroad. It is doubly fitting, therefore, that we set aside one special day for a rededication to the principles espoused by our forefathers, to reaffirm our faith in God, and to draw from the example of Columbus a new courage of conviction so vital in dealing with the tasks which lie ahead.

For these and other reasons it is my privilege to be a cosponsor of Senate bill 108, to make Columbus Day a legal holiday. The Senator from Delaware (Mr. Boggs) is the principal sponsor of the proposal, and he has been joined by 32 other Senators.

Mr. President, more than four-fifths of our 50 States make some official recognition of Columbus Day. The Discovery of the New World is commemorated in 44 States and Puerto Rico; and the occasion is, in my belief, of sufficient importance to warrant the establishment of a legal holiday throughout the entire land.

Christopher Columbus translated the dreams and theories of others into meaningful realities. With the self-discipline and clarity of mind which characterize men of destiny, he renounced a successful career as master of a merchant ship, and followed an idea. He turned away from early retirement and comfort, to risk his very life in an effort to open new trade routes to India. The fruits of his venture have been harvested by all of mankind for nearly 500 years. Truly, his example is a worthy one—and one which we can use to navigate safely the threatening seas of our time.

We must emulate the dedication of that early Italian explorer: his willingness to stake his future on his beliefs; his translation of an idea into action; his perseverance and resourcefulness, which enabled him to overcome the doubts of his fellows and the hazards of the voyage. We must take unto ourselves these qualities of his greatness if America is to continue to be a leader of the free world and a guardian of the rights and responsibilities of mankind.

The establishment of Columbus Day as a time of rededication and introspection could have yet another purpose for Americans: We would, at the same time, recognize the contributions and influences of other peoples and countries in bringing the United States to its current position of responsibility and respect among nations. Especially would a holiday of this nature be a deserved tribute to Americans of Italian descent—whose land of origin is that of Columbus.

Perhaps no nation has supplied more genius and inspiration in the development of human consciousness than has Italy. In the arts, in science, in music, and in service, Italians have been among those who pushed back the frontiers of ignorance and fear. Forever woven into the fabric of American life is the influence of Italy and her children. The continued enrichment of this country is insured by those of Italian ancestry in America, who keep alive the Italians'



sense of humor, their love of beauty, and their zest for life. We shall ever be in their debt.

Christopher Columbus belonged to an age that has passed; yet he became the sign and symbol of a new age of hope. He trusted his ship to the fortunes of the open sea, carried mankind forward in its wake, and raised the curtain on a new world which has cradled the growth of freedom and dignity for the individual.

It is my conviction that passage of this proposal is a fitting way by which we can demonstrate our willingness to come to grips with the future. So I believe we should declare Columbus Day a legal holiday, to be observed with thought, reverence, and a spirit of rededication.

I believe all Senators will wish to give expeditious attention to Senate bill 108, which would make Columbus Day a legal holiday.

Mr. President, in a recent letter to my office, Earl E. Beaumont, State secretary of the West Virginia Council of the Knights of Columbus, has indicated that the provisions of Senate bill 108 have received enthusiastic support among the citizens of the Mountain State. Speaking on behalf of more than 3,400 members of the Knights of Columbus from the 18 councils in West Virginia, Mr. Beaumont urges that Congress act affirmatively on this proposed legislation to make Columbus Day a legal holiday in the United States.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that a listing of the West Virginia councils of the Knights of Columbus, together with their membership totals, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Council	City	Membership
504.....	Wheeling.....	538
594.....	Parkersburg.....	298
608.....	Elkins.....	95
713.....	Grafton.....	72
771.....	Charleston.....	289
872.....	Clarksburg.....	154
942.....	Fairmont.....	100
963.....	Huntington.....	330
1169.....	Martinsburg.....	147
1404.....	Bluefield.....	102
1415.....	Weston.....	92
1907.....	Moundsville.....	193
2593.....	Wheeling.....	93
2954.....	Morgantown.....	263
3135.....	Williamson.....	18
3232.....	Montgomery.....	54
3734.....	Weirton.....	531
4694.....	St. Albans.....	57
Total (18 councils).....		3,426

#### RESOLUTION OF DUTCHESS COUNTY, N.Y., AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Dutchess County American Legion, of Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE DUTCHESS COUNTY AMERICAN LEGION, POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.

Whereas the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, on August 13,

1963, authorized John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of the U.S. Veterans' Administration to care for 2,000 veterans usually taken care by nursing homes;

Whereas President John F. Kennedy in his memorandum, said in part "the changing characteristics of our veteran population, particularly those who served during the First World War, are resulting in an adverse effect on the acute medical programs administered by the Veterans' Administration";

Whereas there are nearly 1 million veterans of World War I who are now aged 70 years or more and the number will increase 50 percent by 1968;

Whereas the Veterans' Administration hospital at Castle Point, N.Y., is ideally equipped for the treatment and care of patients needing nursing care, and due to their experience with patients needing long-term care, and is equipped for rehabilitation and retraining programs, and that there are buildings not now in use that can be used for this type of patient care: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Dutchess County American Legion at the regular constituted meeting on August 21, 1963, at the Arlington Post, American Legion, No. 1302, heartily endorse the action of the President of the United States and the Veterans' Administration in making available facilities for the care of veterans needing nursing home care and hereby petition and urge the Veterans' Administration to make every use of the fine equipment and buildings at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Castle Point, N.Y., for this program; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to President John F. Kennedy and to Hon. John S. Gleason, Jr., Veterans' Administrator and to Hon. Kenneth B. Keating and Hon. Jacob K. Javits, U.S. Senate, and to Hon. J. Ernest Wharton, Member of Congress, and that a committee of 10 members of the Dutchess County American Legion be appointed to further the purpose of these resolutions.

Adopted August 21, 1963.

EDWIN J. STOLL,  
Commander.  
ARNOLD G. FRAZIER,  
Adjutant.

#### RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT 1963 CONVENTION OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the 1963 convention of the American Federation of Teachers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION 23

(Submitted by Denver Federation of Teachers, Local No. 858)

Whereas the United Federation of Teachers, Local 2, American Federation of Teachers, has pioneered in securing collective bargaining status for the 40,000 New York City teachers; and

Whereas the United Federation of Teachers has adopted a policy of "no contract, no work"; and

Whereas the membership of the United Federation has rejected the offer of the New York City Board of Education; and

Whereas a strike has been called by the membership of the United Federation of Teachers to commence September 9: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Teachers strongly support the strike action of local 2; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Federation of Teachers recommend similar support on the part of the leadership of the AFL-CIO.

#### THE SLOVAK CATHOLIC UNION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the present year marks the 70th anniversary of the Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union of Wilkes-Barre, a worthy organization founded by the pioneers of the Pennsylvania anthracite coal regions. The hardships endured by these men and women, their sacrifices in order to lead a better life, and especially many fraternal organizations and societies they founded, helped to make great the Commonwealth which I represent. Mr. John C. Sciranka, the well-known American-Slovak journalist, has composed a lengthy and thorough article describing the Wilkes-Barre Union, its outstanding founders, and its wide variety of activities. The article appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader on August 12, 1963, and I now ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SLOVAK CATHOLIC UNION MILESTONE

EDITOR, TIMES-LEADER NEWS:

The Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, with offices at 173 North Main Street, Wilkes-Barre, this year is observing its 70th anniversary.

Inasmuch as the union was founded in Luzerne County and most of its activities took place here in the past seven decades, it is proper to review briefly at this time its history.

The organizers were representatives of Slovak miners from the anthracite region, who were members of other organizations already in existence. However, there were too many deaths claimed by the mines seven decades ago and even large insurance companies were reluctant in signing up the miners, who were considered a bad risk.

In those days, monthly assessments of members of fraternal organizations were calculated and established on the basis of death claims. There were no structural mortuary tables. All members were equal and paid dues alike.

The fraternal pioneers acted in good faith and true Christian and fraternal spirit and that is why it took in some cases almost 40 years until their organizations were put on sound financial basis, with actuarial calculations and modern insurance methods with reserves.

And these organizations, like the Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, which was established for the Catholics of Latin and Byzantine Rites, were also instrumental in aiding the establishment of churches, schools, and other institutions. They were also ready to aid their persecuted brethren in Slovakia. The organization, through its newspaper, "Bratstvo" (Brotherhood), established 64 years ago by Edmund Uffalussy, was a great educational medium.

The sons and daughters of these pioneers, like for example Maj. Gen. William Shambora, formerly of Hazleton, later with the Medical Corps and commander of one of the largest U.S. military hospitals in Texas, admitted several years ago at the banquet of the Slovak Club of Luzerne County, that it was through the medium of this union and its official organ that the parents were encouraged to give their children better education, which in their old country was accorded only to the privileged class.

We could go on mentioning the great patriotic, humanitarian, and religious mission

which this Slovak Union and similar organizations performed and still carry on but space does not permit it. However, on this 70th anniversary, it is proper to recall at least some of the pioneers, who made these sacrifices.

According to official records, the first meeting for the purpose of forming this organization was held on June 24 and 25, 1893, on the third floor of Francis Juskewicz's Building, 68 North Main Street, Pittston. This meeting was arranged by Edmund Uffalussy, Joseph Pison, and John Marinko.

The scheduled meeting on June 24, 1893, was opened by Vincent Kalman as chairman and Joseph Kiesel said the prayer. The following representatives were present at this historical founders' conclave: John Dugas, John Marinko, Francis Oravec, and Joseph Kiesel, as representatives of St. Joseph's Society, Hazleton, which became branch 1, of the Pennsylvania Slovak Roman and Greek Catholic Union and which observed its 75th anniversary 3 years ago.

#### LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES

Joseph Vysoudil represented St. Joseph's Society of Weston; Michael Mirdala, St. Michael's Society, Hazleton; Adam Jurisin, Blessed Virgin's Rosary Society, Ashley; John Bartek, St. Peter and Paul Society, Wilkes-Barre; Michael Sekula, St. Valentine Society, Port Griffith; George Skrinak and Peter Dobos, St. John Society, Exeter; Andrew Skvir and J. Kascak, St. Vladimir's Society, Pleasant Hill; Andrew Pavlik, St. John Nepomucene Society, Freeland; Joseph Pison, St. Wendeline Society, Forty Fort; and Edmund Uffalussy, Vincent Kalman, and Stephen Wagner, St. John the Baptist Society, Pittston.

The deliberations continued and were adjourned until the following day, which was Sunday, June 25, 1893, when besides the above mentioned, also the following registered and took part in the initial founders' meeting: M. Markovic and Stephen Bodnar, St. Mary's Society, Kingston; John Varganin, and Stephen Hudak, St. Stephen's Society, Plymouth; John Grula, St. John Nepomucene Society, Luzerne; and Andrew Lupco, St. Joseph's Society, Nanticoke.

Edmund Uffalussy was elected temporary chairman and Joseph Kiesel, temporary secretary. Here it was decided to form the Pennsylvania Slovak Roman and Greek Catholic Union. The death benefit was set at \$500 for a male member and \$200 for female. Those injured and not capable of performing their job will receive full benefit and the injured of the second class \$100 benefit.

The following first supreme officers were elected: Francis Oravec, president; Andrew Skvir, vice president; Joseph Kiesel, secretary; Edmund Uffalussy, treasurer; Vincent Kalman, Andrew Pavlik, and John Dugas, auditors.

St. John the Baptist was chosen for the patron of the organization. Seven societies joined the new organization with a total membership of 456.

The first formal convention was held on June 25, 26, and 27, 1894, at Hazleton. Francis Oravec was again chosen president. He was followed in office by Edmund Uffalussy. During the third convention at Freeland on June 24, 25, and 26, 1896, Francis Oravec died and the entire convention attended his funeral.

The following served as supreme presidents of the union: Andrew Lupcho, Nanticoke, 8 years; John Marinko, Hazleton, one term; Michael Lapchak, Lansford and later Hazleton, from 1909 until 1918; John H. Kaminsky, Uniontown, from 1918 until 1925; Joseph Kiesel, Scranton, from 1925 until 1929; John Kridlo, Pittston, 1929-50 and the current president, Stephen J. Tkach, Dallas, from 1950.

Joseph Pison served in 1898 for a brief period of 2 months. He died in office.

The present supreme officers are: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stephen J. Krasula, New York, honorary chaplain; Hon. John T. Kmetz, Nanticoke, honorary supreme president; Rev. John A. Balberchak, supreme chaplain, Forest City; Stephen J. Tkach, Dallas, supreme president; Stephen J. Kavulich, Taylor, first vice president; Martin Desht, Allentown, second vice president; Martin Podskoc, Jr., Wilkes-Barre, secretary; Miss Anna Simkovich, Hazleton, treasurer; Michael Bonchonsky, Pittston, chairman of supreme auditors; Thomas Onzik, Larksville, secretary of supreme auditors; Andrew Dzurek, Hazleton, Aloysius Kridlo, Pittston, Frank Parrish, Hazleton, and John P. Stankovich, Pittsburgh, supreme auditors.

In 1898, Edmund Uffalussy, Edmund Lem-bick, Michael Lapchak and John Marinko were instrumental in aiding their wives and friends to organize the Ladies Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, which is a separate organization with offices in Wilkes-Barre, publishing its official organ, Zornicka (Morning Star) and showing steady progress.

JOHN C. SCIRANKA.

### IMPROVED LABELING OF PESTICIDES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the question of adequate labeling of pesticides has come up frequently during the hearings on the use of pesticides now being conducted by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations. The Federal pest control law has been described by those who administer it as being "basically a labeling law." It is of extreme importance, then, that the labeling requirements of such a law be adequate to afford the highest measure of protection to the public.

When the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before our subcommittee to present his Department's views on the pesticide problem, I asked him to look into the adequacy of present labeling requirements and to come up with some recommendations as to what he thought would be proper. I am very pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate, the action taken today by the Secretary of Agriculture, who has proposed a revision of the regulations covering labeling and enforcement under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, at this point, the Secretary's notice of rulemaking, as it appeared in this morning's Federal Register.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### [7 CFR Part 362]

#### FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT: NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

Notice is hereby given in accordance with section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), that the Department of Agriculture, pursuant to section 6 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135d), is considering the revision of the regulations for the enforcement of the act (7 CFR 362.1 et seq.).

The revision, in general, would strengthen the regulations with respect to labeling requirements, conform the regulations with interpretations and policies followed in administration of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and clarify certain provisions of the regulations. The principal specific changes that would be made are indicated below.

The use of an appropriate foreign language version of the label, in addition to the English version, would be permitted in areas of the United States where such language is spoken. The requirements regarding legibility and placement of labels are clarified in that specifications regarding size of type to be used in connection with required warnings or cautions are set forth, and provisions are made that the ingredient statement, required warnings or cautions, and designated signal words shall appear on the front part of the label or that part of the label displayed under customary conditions of purchase unless otherwise authorized by the Director. Provision is made that economic poisons shall bear the statement "Keep out of reach of children" and such a signal word as the Director may prescribe. Any claims such as "Safe," "Non-poisonous," "Non-toxic," "Non-injurious," or "Harmless" would not be permitted on the labeling.

The provision concerning determination of economic poisons highly toxic to man reflects certain strengthening of the testing procedures and specifies the number and type of laboratory animals to be used. Provision is also made that registration of any economic poison may be refused if, in the opinion of the Director, directions, or warnings cannot be written which would when followed prevent injury to the general public.

The regulation dealing with the handling of experimental compounds is clarified in that authority is provided for the Director to refuse a permit for shipment of an experimental compound for any use that might result in residues on food or feed unless a tolerance or an exemption from the need of a tolerance has been established by the Food and Drug Administration. The revision further provides for certain other restrictions on issuance of experimental permits.

It is proposed to revise the regulations to read as follows:

#### "GENERAL

"§ 362.1 Words in singular form.

"Words used in the singular form in this subpart shall include the plural, and vice versa, as the case may require.

"§ 362.2 Terms defined.

"Terms used in this subpart shall have the meanings set forth for such terms in the act. In addition, as used in this subpart, the following terms shall have the meanings stated below:

"(a) Act: 'act' means the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended.

"(b) Director: 'Director' means the Director of the Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, or any officer or employee to whom he has heretofore lawfully delegated or to whom he may hereafter lawfully delegate the authority to act in his stead.

"(c) Official inspector: 'Official inspector' means any employee or agent of the Department of Agriculture or the Treasury Department authorized by the Director or by the Secretary of the Treasury to make investigations in connection with enforcement of the act.

"(d) Vertebrate animals: 'Vertebrate animals' means all species of the subphylum vertebrata including domestic vertebrates and vertebrate species of fish and wildlife.

"(e) Invertebrate animals: 'Invertebrate animals' means all forms of animal life other than vertebrate animals, including both domestic and wild species.

"§ 362.3 Administration.

"The Director is authorized to take such action as, in his discretion, may be necessary in the administration and enforcement of the act and the regulations in this part.



## "LABELING"

## "§ 362.4 Labeling required."

"Every economic poison shall bear a label containing the information specified in the act and the regulations in this part."

## "§ 362.5 Language to be used."

"All statements, words, and other information required by the act or the regulations in this part to appear on the label or labeling of any economic poison shall be in the English language: *Provided*, That shipments of articles intended solely for sale in foreign countries may bear labels or labeling in the appropriate foreign language. The Director may permit the use of an appropriate foreign language version of the label or labeling in addition to the English version on products intended for distribution in areas of the United States where a large percentage of the population does not speak English."

## "§ 362.6 Labeling."

"(a) Contents of label and labeling: The label of every economic poison must show, clearly and prominently, the name, brand or trademark under which the product is sold; the name and address of the manufacturer, registrant, or person for whom manufactured; the net contents as prescribed in paragraph (d) of this section; an ingredient statement as prescribed in § 362.7, and an appropriate warning or caution statement as prescribed in § 362.9. The label or labeling of every economic poison must bear directions for use which are necessary and if complied with, adequate for the protection of the public."

"(b) Placement of label: The label shall appear on the economic poison or the immediate container thereof. If the immediate container is enclosed within a wrapper or outside container through which the label cannot be clearly read by a person with normal vision, the label must also appear on such outside wrapper or container if it is a part of the retail package. The label need not appear on shipping containers from which the retail package will be removed prior to being displayed or offered for retail sale."

"(c) Name and address of manufacturer, distributor, packer, formulator, or registrant: An unqualified name and address given on the label shall be considered as the name and address of the manufacturer. If the registrant's name appears on the label and the registrant is not the manufacturer, or if the name of the person for whom the economic poison was manufactured appears on the label, it must be qualified by appropriate wording such as 'Packed for \* \* \*', 'Distributed by \* \* \*', or 'Sold by \* \* \*' to show that the name is not that of the manufacturer. If a person has two or more locations at which an economic poison is manufactured or packaged, or from which it is distributed, the name and address of the person's principal office will be acceptable except in cases where the Director determines that the address of the exact location is necessary for the protection of the public. The address of the manufacturer, registrant, or person for whom manufactured shall include the street address, if any, unless the street address is shown in a current city directory or telephone directory."

"(d) Name, brand, or trademark of economic poison: The name, brand, or trademark of the economic poison, appearing on the label shall be that under which the economic poison is registered."

## "(e) Net content:"

"(1) The net content shall be exclusive of wrappers or other material, and shall be deemed to be average content unless stated as a minimum quantity."

"(2) Net content shall be stated in the terms of weight or measure in general use by consumers and users of the type of economic poison to give accurate information as to the quantity of the economic poison. If there is no general use, the net content statement shall be in terms of liquid meas-

ure if the product is a liquid, and in terms of weight if it is solid, semisolid, viscous, or a mixture of liquid and solid. Statements of liquid measure shall be in terms of the United States, gallon, quart, pint, and fluid ounce at 68° F. The statements of weight shall be in terms of avoirdupois pound and ounce. All statements of net content shall be in terms of the largest unit present."

"(3) If the contents are stated as a minimum quantity, variation below the stated quantity is not permissible and variation above shall not be unreasonably large."

"(4) If the contents are not stated as a minimum quantity, variation shall be permitted only to the extent that it represents deviations unavoidable in good packing practice. The average quantity in the packages in a shipment shall not fall below the average quantity stated, nor shall there be any unreasonable variation from the average in the contents of any package."

"(f) Legibility of label and labeling: All words, statements, graphic representations, or designs required by the regulations in this part to appear on the label or labeling must be clearly legible and easy to read by a person with normal vision. The signal word and the statement 'Keep out of reach of children' prescribed in section 362.9(a) shall be of a size bearing a reasonable relationship to the other type on the front part of the label and to the size of the container. The signal word shall not be less than 18-point type and the said warning statement shall not be less than 12-point type, unless the label space on the container is too small to accommodate such type sizes in which case the Director shall prescribe the type sizes. When the size of the label space requires a reduction in type size, the reduction shall be made to a size no smaller than is necessary and in no event to a size smaller than 6-point type."

## "§ 362.7 Ingredient statement."

"(a) Location of ingredient statement: The ingredient statement must appear on the front panel or that part of the label displayed under customary conditions of purchase, except in rare cases where the Director determines that, due to the size or form of the container, a statement on that portion of the label is impracticable, and permits such statement to appear on another side or panel of the label. Regardless of the placement of the ingredient statement on the label, it shall be sufficiently prominent and in type size which can be easily read by a person with normal vision. The ingredient statement must run parallel with other printed matter on the panel of the label on which it appears and must be on a clear contrasting background not obscured or crowded."

"(b) Names of ingredients: The common name of each of the listed ingredients must be given or, if an ingredient has no common name, the correct chemical name as accepted by the editors of "Chemical Abstracts" published by American Chemical Society. If there is no common name and the chemical composition is complex, the Director may permit the use of a new or coined name which he finds to be appropriate for the information and protection of the user. If the use of a new or coined name is permitted, the Director may prescribe the terms under which it may be used. A trademark or trade name shall not be used as the name of an ingredient except when it has become a common name."

"(c) Percentages of ingredients: Percentages of ingredients shall be determined by weight and the sum of the percentages of the ingredients shall be 100. Sliding scale forms of ingredient statements shall not be used."

## "(d) Designation of ingredients:"

"(1) Active ingredients and inert ingredients shall be so designated, and the term 'inert ingredients' shall appear in the same size type and be equally as prominent as the term 'active ingredients.'"

"(2) If the name but not the percentage of each active ingredient is given, the names of the active and inert ingredients shall, respectively, be shown in the descending order of the percentage of each present in each classification and the name of each ingredient shall be given equal prominence."

"(e) Active ingredient content: As long as an economic poison is subject to the act the percentages of active ingredients in the economic poison shall be those declared in the ingredient statement."

## "§ 362.8 Economic poisons highly toxic to man."

"Oral toxicity and inhalation toxicity tests shall be conducted on both rodent and non-rodent species of animals. Skin absorption toxicity tests shall be conducted on rabbits, unless testing on another species of animal is authorized by the Director. Economic poisons which fall within any of the following categories when tested on laboratory animals as specified in this section, are highly toxic to man or contain substances or quantities of substances highly toxic to man within the meaning of the act (such economic poisons being hereinafter in this part referred to as economic poisons highly toxic to man); *Provided, however*, That the Director may, upon application and after opportunity for hearing, exempt any economic poison which is in any of these categories, but which is not in fact highly toxic to man, from the requirements of the act and the regulations in this part with respect to economic poisons highly toxic to man:

"(a) Oral toxicity: Economic poisons which produce death within 14 days in half or more than half of the test animals of either species at a dosage of 50 milligrams at a single dose, or less, per kilogram body weight when administered orally to 10 or more animals of the rodent species, such as rats, mice, rabbits, or guinea pigs, and 8 or more of a nonrodent species, such as dogs or cats."

"(b) Toxicity on inhalation: Economic poisons which produce death within 14 days in half or more than half of the test animals of either species at a dosage of 2,000 micrograms of a dust or mist product per liter of air, or 200 parts per million by volume of a gas or vapor, when administered by continuous inhalation for 1 hour or less to 10 or more animals of the rodent species, such as rats, mice, rabbits, or guinea pigs, and 8 or more of a nonrodent species, such as dogs or cats."

"(c) Toxicity by skin absorption: Economic poisons which produce death within 14 days in half or more than half of the test animals tested at a dosage of 200 milligrams or less per kilogram of body weight when administered by continuous contact with the bare skin for 24 hours or less to 10 or more animals."

"(d) Toxicity based on human experience: If the Director finds, after opportunity for hearing, that available data on human experience with any economic poison indicate a toxicity greater than that determined from the above described tests on animals, the human data shall take precedence and, if he finds that the protection of the public health so requires, the Director shall declare such an economic poison to be highly toxic to man for the purposes of this act and the regulations thereunder."

## "§ 362.9 Warning or caution statement."

"Warning or caution statements, which are necessary to prevent injury to living man and useful vertebrate animals, useful vegetation, and useful invertebrate animals, must appear on the label in a place sufficiently prominent to warn the user, and must state clearly and in nontechnical language the particular hazard involved in the use of the economic poison, e.g., ingestion, skin absorption, inhalation, flammability or explosion, and the precautions to be taken to avoid accident, injury, or damage."

"(a) The label of every economic poison shall bear warnings or cautions which are necessary for the protection of the public, including the statement, 'Keep out of reach of children,' and a signal word such as 'Poison,' 'Danger,' 'Warning,' or 'Caution' as the Director may prescribe, on the front panel or that part of the label displayed under customary conditions of purchase: *Provided, however,* The Director may permit reasonable variations in the placement of that part of the required warnings and cautions other than the statement 'Keep out of reach of children' and the required signal word, if in his opinion such variations would not be injurious to the public. If an economic poison is marketed in channels of trade where the likelihood of contact with children is extremely remote, the Director may waive the requirement of the statement 'Keep out of reach of children' if in his opinion such a statement is not necessary to prevent injury to the public.

"(b) The label of every economic poison which is highly toxic to man as described in § 362.8 shall bear the word 'Poison' in red on a contrasting background in immediate proximity to the skull and crossbones and an antidote statement including directions to call a physician immediately, on the front panel or that part of the label displayed under customary conditions of purchase: *Provided, however,* the Director may permit reasonable variations in the placement of the antidote statement if some reference such as 'See antidote statement on back panel' appears on the front panel near the word 'Poison' and the skull and crossbones.

#### "REGISTRATION"

##### "§ 362.10 Registration.

"(a) Eligibility: Any manufacturer, packer, seller, distributor, or shipper of an economic poison is eligible to apply for registration of such economic poison.

"(b) Effect of registration: If an economic poison is registered under the act no further registration under the act by other persons is required: *Provided, That—*

"(1) The product is in the manufacturer's or registrant's original unbroken immediate container; and

"(2) The claims made for it and the directions for its use do not differ from the representations made in connection with registration; and

"(3) The product contains the labeling accepted in connection with registration or otherwise complies with the act.

"(c) Procedure for registration: Applications for registration should be addressed to Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250. Application forms will be furnished upon request. All applications for registration shall be accompanied by duplicate copies of the proposed labeling, including all printed or graphic matter which is to accompany the economic poison at any time and, if requested by the Director, a full description of the tests made and the results thereof upon which the claims for the economic poison are based, together with such other information as may be necessary to assure compliance with the act and the regulations in this part. If any part of the proposed labeling submitted is in a foreign language, it shall be accompanied by an accurate and complete English translation. Applications should be submitted as far in advance as possible, and at least 30 days, before it is desired that registration take effect. However, the period of time required to process applications to determine the adequacy of the proposed labeling may exceed 30 days in some cases. Applications which require consultation with other governmental agencies will take a longer period of processing. No fees are charged for registration.

"(d) Effective date of registration: Registration of an economic poison shall become

effective on the date the notice of registration is issued.

"(e) Responsibility of a registrant: The registrant is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of all information submitted in connection with his application for registration of an economic poison.

"(f) Changes in labeling or formulas:

"(1) Changes in the labeling or changes in the formula of a registered economic poison must be submitted in advance to the Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250. The registrant must describe the exact changes desired and the proposed effective date and, upon request, shall submit a description of tests which justify such changes.

"(2) After the effective date of a change in labeling or formula, the product shall be marketed only under the new claims or formula: *Provided, however,* The Director may permit a reasonable time for the disposition of stocks of the discontinued product, if in his opinion such an extension would not endanger the public.

"(g) Claims must conform to registration: Claims made for an economic poison must not differ from representations made in connection with registration, including representations with respect to effectiveness, ingredients, directions for use, or pests against which the product is recommended.

"(h) Duration of registration: If at any time it does not appear to the Director that the economic poison is such as to warrant the proposed claims for it or if the economic poison and its labeling and other material required to be submitted do not comply with the provisions of the act, the Director shall notify the registrant of the facts involved and afford him an opportunity to correct the labeling so as to comply with the act. If after a reasonable period of time, the registrant has not corrected the labeling, the Director may cancel the registration under the provisions of section 4c of the act. Unless canceled in accordance with this paragraph or with the acquiescence of the registrant, or unless continued in effect in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (i) of this section, the registration of an economic poison shall be canceled at the end of a period of 5 years following the date of registration of such economic poison, or at the end of 5 years following the date of any subsequent registered change in formula or labeling, or at the end of 5 years following the date of any continuance of registration pursuant to paragraph (i) of this section: *Provided, however,* That prior to any such cancellation the Pesticides Regulation Division shall send to the registrant a notice of intent to cancel, and, in the event such notice is not sent to the registrant 30 days prior to the expiration of the 5-year period, the registration shall remain in effect until 30 days following the date such notice has been sent to the registrant at his latest address submitted to the Pesticides Regulation Division.

"(i) Continuance of registration: If a registrant desires to continue the registration in effect, he shall notify the Pesticides Regulation Division in writing and it shall be continued in effect under the same terms as the original registration: *Provided, however,* That if, on the basis of information available at the time, it appears that the product or its labeling fails to comply with the act, the registrant shall be so notified and afforded the opportunity to make the necessary corrections. If the corrections are not made, registration will be canceled as provided in section 4c of the act.

"(j) Limitations on registrations: The Director may refuse to register any economic poison or any specific use thereof, if in his opinion, directions and warnings cannot be written which will, when followed, prevent injury to the general public. If, however, such an economic poison is proposed for cer-

tain acceptable uses, the Director may require the label to bear a warning against specific unacceptable uses such as in the home or home garden.

#### "GUARANTEES"

##### "§ 362.11 Guarantee of economic poison.

"(a) By whom given; Effect of guarantee: Any manufacturer, distributor, wholesaler, or other person residing in the United States may furnish to any person to whom he sells an economic poison a guarantee that the economic poison was lawfully registered at the time of sale and delivery to such person, and that the economic poison complies with all the requirements of the act and of the regulations in this part. The act provides that penalties for violation of section 3a of the act shall not apply to a person who establishes that he has received a guarantee as specified in the act.

"(b) Reference to guarantee: No reference to a guarantee or suggestion that such a guarantee has been given shall be made in the labeling of any economic poison.

"(c) Contents of guarantee: In order to afford effective protection, each guarantee must:

"(1) Be signed by and contain the name and address of the person giving it; and

"(2) State that the economic poison was lawfully registered at the time of sale and delivery and that it complies with all other requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

"(d) Scope of guarantee: A guarantee may be (1) limited to a specific shipment or other delivery of a product, in which case it shall be a part of or attached to the invoice or bill of sale covering such shipment or delivery, or (2) general and continuing, in which case, in its application to any shipment or other delivery of a product it shall be considered to have been given at the date when such product was shipped or delivered by the person giving the guarantee.

"(e) Expiration of guarantee: Any guarantee shall expire when the product is repacked or relabeled by the purchaser or when it becomes in violation of the act or the regulations in this part after shipment or other delivery by the person who gave such guarantee.

"(f) Forms of guarantee: The following are suggested forms of guarantee:

"(1) Limited form for use on invoice or bill of sale:

"----- hereby guarantees

"(Name of guarantor)  
that the economic poison herein listed is lawfully registered with the Secretary of Agriculture and that the same complies with all requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

"-----  
"(Signature and post office address of guarantor)

"-----  
"(Date)

"(2) General and continuing form:  
"The economic poisons comprising each shipment or other delivery hereafter made by -----, to or on the order of  
"(Name of guarantor)

----- are hereby  
"(Name and address of person receiving guarantee)  
guaranteed to be lawfully registered with the Secretary of Agriculture and to comply with all requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as of the date of such shipment or delivery.

"-----  
"(Signature and post office address of guarantor)

"-----  
"(Date)

##### "COLORATION OF ECONOMIC POISONS"

"§ 362.12 Coloration and discoloration.  
"The white economic poisons hereinafter named shall be colored or discolored in ac-



cordance with this section. The hues, values, and chromas specified are those contained in the Munsell Book of Color, Munsell Color Co., 10 East Franklin Street, Baltimore, Md.

"(a) Coloring agent: The coloring agent must produce a uniformly colored product not subject to change in color beyond the requirements specified in the regulations in this part during ordinary conditions of marketing or storage, and must not cause the product to be ineffective or result in its causing damage when used as directed.

"(b) Arsenicals and barium fluosilicate: Standard lead arsenate, basic lead arsenate, calcium arsenate, magnesium arsenate, zinc arsenate, zinc arsenite, and barium fluosilicate shall be colored any hue, except the yellow-reds and yellows, having a value of not more than 8 and a chroma of not less than 4, or shall be discolored to a neutral lightness value not over 7.

"(c) Sodium fluoride and sodium fluosilicate: Sodium fluoride and sodium fluosilicate shall be colored blue or green having a value of not more than 8 and a chroma of not less than 4, or shall be discolored to a neutral lightness value not over 7.

"(d) Exceptions:

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, the Director, after opportunity for hearing, may permit other hues to be used for any particular purpose if he determines that use of the prescribed hues is not feasible for such purpose and that such action will not be injurious to the public.

"(2) Any economic poison specified in this part which is intended solely for use by a textile manufacturer or commercial laundry, cleaner or dyer as a mothproofing agent, which would not be suitable for such use if colored and which will not come into the hands of the public except when incorporated into a fabric may be exempted by the Director from the requirements of section 3a(4) of the act and the requirements of this section.

"(3) The economic poison sodium fluoride shall be exempt from the requirements of section 3a(4) of the act and paragraph (c) of this section when (i) it is intended for use as a fungicide solely in the manufacture or processing of rubber, glue, or leather goods; (ii) coloration of the economic poison in accordance with said requirements will be likely to impart objectionable color characteristics to the finished goods; (iii) the economic poison will not be present in such finished goods in sufficient quantities to cause injury to any person; and (iv) the economic poison will not come into the hands of the public except after incorporation into such finished goods.

#### "ADULTERATION AND MISBRANDING

##### "§ 362.15 Adulteration.

"An economic poison is adulterated if, upon analysis, it is found that any active ingredient listed on the label is not present in the amount represented in the ingredient statement; or if it is found that any ingredient has been added which will affect the effectiveness of the product as an economic poison and will increase its toxicity.

##### "§ 362.14 Misbranding.

"An economic poison or device is misbranded if the article or its labeling is false or misleading to the public in any particular.

"(a) Examples of false or misleading representation in the labeling of an economic poison or device which render it misbranded are the following:

"(1) A false or misleading statement concerning composition of the product.

"(2) A false or misleading statement concerning the effectiveness of the product as an economic poison or device.

"(3) A false or misleading statement about the value of the product for purposes other than as an economic poison or device.

"(4) A false or misleading comparison with other economic poisons or devices.

"(5) A false or misleading representation as to the safety of the economic poison or its ingredients, including a statement such as 'Safe,' 'Nonpoisonous,' 'Nontoxic,' 'Noninjurious,' or 'Harmless' with or without such a qualifying phrase as 'When used as directed.'

"(6) Any statement directly or indirectly implying that the economic poison or device is recommended or endorsed by any agency of the Federal Government.

"(7) The name of an economic poison which contains two or more principal active ingredients if it suggests the name of one or more but not all such principal active ingredients even though the names of the other ingredients are stated elsewhere in the labeling.

"(8) Prominent reference in the labeling to one or more active ingredients without giving their percentages in immediate proximity thereto or without giving equal prominence to the other active ingredients or to the inert ingredients.

"(9) A true statement used in such a way as to give a false or misleading impression to the purchaser.

"(b) Justification of false and misleading statements not permitted:

"(1) The use of any false or misleading statement on any part of the labeling, given as the statement or opinion of any person or based upon such statement or opinion, shall not be justified by the fact that the statement or opinion is actually that of such person.

"(2) The use of a false or misleading statement in the labeling cannot be justified by an explanatory statement.

#### "ENFORCEMENT

##### "§ 362.15 Enforcement.

"(a) Collection of samples: Samples of economic poisons and devices shall be collected by official inspectors or by any employee of the Federal Government, or of a State or territory, or political subdivision thereof who has been duly designated as an official inspector by the Director.

"(b) Examination of samples: Methods of examination of samples shall be those adopted and published by the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, where applicable, or such other methods as the Director may find necessary to determine whether the product complies with the law.

"(c) Notice of apparent violation:

"(1) If, from an examination or analysis, an economic poison or device appears to be in violation of the act, a notice in writing shall be sent to the person against whom criminal proceedings are contemplated, giving him 20 days within which to offer such written explanation as he may desire. The notice shall state the manner in which the sample fails to meet the requirements of the act and the regulations thereunder.

"(2) Any such person may, in addition to his reply to such notice, file within 20 days of its receipt a written request for an opportunity to present his views orally in connection therewith.

"(3) No notice or hearing is required prior to the seizure of any economic poison or device.

##### "§ 362.16 Notices of judgment.

"Publication of notices of judgments of the courts in cases arising under the criminal or seizure provisions of the act shall be made in the form of notices, circulars, or bulletins as the Director may prescribe.

#### "PERMITS FOR EXPERIMENTAL USE

##### "§ 362.17 Shipments for experimental use.

"(a) Articles for which no permit is required:

"(1) A substance or mixture of substances being put through tests in which the purpose is only to determine its value for economic

poison purposes or to determine its toxicity or other properties, and where the user does not expect to receive any benefit in pest control from its use, is not considered an economic poison within the meaning of section 2a of the act. Therefore, no permit under the act is required for its shipment.

"(2) An economic poison shipped or delivered for experimental use by or under the supervision of any Federal or State agency authorized by law to conduct research in the field of economic poisons shall not be subject to the provisions of the act and the regulations in this part.

"(b) Articles for which permit is required:

"(1) An economic poison shipped or delivered for experimental use by qualified persons but not under the supervision of a Federal or State agency authorized by law to conduct research in the field of economic poisons, for which a permit has been issued by the Director pursuant to the provisions of this section, shall otherwise be exempt from the provisions of the act and of the regulations in this part. Permits will be of two types, specific and general. A specific permit will be issued to cover a particular shipment on a specified date to a named person. A general permit will be issued to cover more than one shipment over a period of time to different persons.

"(2) If an economic poison is to be tested for a use which is likely to result in a residue on or in food or feed, a permit for shipment will be issued only when:

"(i) The food or feed product will not be used for food or feed except for laboratory or experimental animals, or

"(ii) Sufficient data are submitted to show that no illegal residue will be present on food or feed derived from the experimental program or

"(iii) A tolerance or exemption from the need of a tolerance, or a temporary tolerance or a temporary exemption from the need of a tolerance, has been established by the Food and Drug Administration to cover any detectable residue which may be present on food or feed derived from the experimental program.

"(3) A permit for shipment of any experimental economic poison for testing in any place likely to be frequented by people will be granted only if it is clearly shown in the application for such permit that the applicant's instructions for use reasonably assure the avoidance of injury to all persons concerned.

"(4) All applications for permits covering shipments for experimental use shall be filed in duplicate with the Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250, and must be signed by the shipper and must contain the following:

"(i) Name and address of the shipper and place or places from which the shipment will be made.

"(ii) Proposed date of shipment or proposed shipping period not to exceed 1 year.

"(iii) A statement of the composition of material to be covered by the permit which should apply to a single material or group of closely allied formulations of the material.

"(iv) A statement of the approximate quantity of material to be shipped.

"(v) Available data or information, or reference to available data or information, on the toxicity of the economic poison.

"(vi) A statement of the nature of the proposed experimental program, including designation of the type of pests or organisms to be experimented with, the crops or animals on which the economic poison is to be used, a statement of the dates during which the proposed experimental program will be conducted, and the States or geographical areas where it is proposed to conduct the program, and including the results of previous tests where necessary to justify the

issuance of a permit for the quantity requested.

"(vii) An affidavit to the effect that food or feed derived from the experimental program will not be used or offered for consumption or sale for consumption, except by laboratory or experimental animals until acceptable analytical data are furnished to the Department to show that no residues are present in or on such food or feed or that the residues present are within the tolerance or temporary tolerance limits established by the Food and Drug Administration.

"(viii) The percentage of the total quantity of material specified under subdivision (iv) of this subparagraph which will be supplied without charge to the user.

"(ix) A statement that the economic poison is intended for experimental use only.

"(x) Proposed labeling which must bear (a) the prominent statement 'For Experimental Use Only' on the container label and any accompanying circular or other labeling, (b) a warning or caution statement if in the opinion of the Director it is necessary, which statement shall, if compiled with, be adequate in his opinion, for the protection of those who may handle or be exposed to the experimental formulations, (c) the name and address of the applicant for the permit, (d) the name or designation of the formulation, and (e) an ingredient statement as prescribed in § 362.7.

"(5) The Director may limit the quantity of economic poison covered by a permit to such less quantity than requested as he may determine if the available information on effectiveness, or toxicity or other hazards, is not sufficient to justify the scope of experimental use proposed in the application, or may make such other limitations in the permit as he may determine to be necessary for the protection of the public.

"(6) An economic poison shipped under a permit shall not be offered for general retail sale.

"(c) General permit for economic poisons for experimental use which are also subject to the new drug requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act:

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section, a general permit is hereby issued under section 7.a.(4) of the act to the manufacturers and shippers of economic poisons for experimental use only, to ship such economic poisons: *Provided*, (i) That the product is a 'new drug' within the meaning of section 201(p) and 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. sec. 321(p) and sec. 355); (ii) that it is subject to, and the manufacturer or shipper complies with, the provisions of section 505(i) of said act (21 U.S.C. sec. 355(i)) and § 130.3 of the regulations (21 CFR 130.3) thereunder; and (iii) that the documents referred to in said § 130.3 shall be made available for inspection upon the request of any officer or employee of the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture at any reasonable time within 3 years after the introduction of the product into interstate commerce.

"(2) The general permit referred to in the preceding paragraph shall apply only insofar as the experimental uses are for drug purposes within the meaning of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. It shall not apply to other experimental uses even though the product may be intended for both drug and nondrug uses.

"(d) Cancellation of permits: Any permit for shipment for experimental use may be canceled at any time for any violation of the terms thereof or if it shall appear to the Director that the permit should be canceled for the protection of the public.

#### "DECLARATION OF PESTS

"§ 362.25 Forms of plant and animal life and viruses declared to be pests.

"(a) Each of the following forms of plant and animal life and viruses is declared to be

a pest under the act when it exists under circumstances that make it injurious to plants, man, domestic animals, other useful vertebrates, useful invertebrates, or other articles or substances:

"Mammals, including but not limited to dogs, cats, moles, bats, wild carnivores, armadillos, and deer;

"Birds, including but not limited to starlings, English sparrows, crows, and blackbirds;

"Fishes, including but not limited to the jawless fishes such as the sea lamprey, the cartilaginous fishes such as the sharks, and the bony fishes such as the carp;

"Amphibians and reptiles, including but not limited to poisonous snakes;

"Aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates, including but not limited to slugs, snails, and crayfish;

"Roots and other plant parts growing where not wanted;

"Viruses, other than those on or in living man or other animals."

Any interested person who wishes to submit written data, views, or arguments concerning the proposed revision of the regulations may do so by filing them with the Director, Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250, not later than 60 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 3d day of September 1963.

M. R. CLARKSON,  
Acting Administrator,  
Agricultural Research Service.

[F.R. Doc. 63-9541; Filed, Sept. 4, 1963;  
8:50 a.m.]

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in the past, I have referred to the problem of "bureaucratic blight" in the Department of Agriculture. The proposed revision of the pesticide labeling laws advanced today by Secretary Freeman are an example, not of bureaucratic blight, but of highly competent technicians and civil servants acting in the public interest, under what is obviously firm and resolute leadership from the Secretary of Agriculture. He and his entire Department and those who worked with him from other departments in developing these new regulations, deserve our highest praise.

These regulations represent the best thinking of the Department of Agriculture, at this time. Secretary Freeman has wisely suggested a 60-day period in which all interested and affected parties can comment. I urge all consumer groups throughout the country to review this proposed regulation carefully and recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture any improvements that may be necessary. In this way they can contribute to the betterment of our consumer protection laws and regulations.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR GRUENING AT DEDICATION OF FORESTRY LABORATORY AT UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on July 25, 1963, the able Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] delivered an outstanding address at the dedication of the Forestry Laboratory at the University of Alaska.

The Senator from Alaska has strongly supported a forward-looking forestry program for his State, and was qualified in every way to dedicate this laboratory,

which he did with a worthy and timely address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### AMERICA'S FARTHEST NORTH FORESTRY LABORATORY

This is a happy and I believe an important occasion. We are here to join in the dedication of the Forestry Sciences Laboratory, which is a research facility of the Northern Forest Experiment Station whose headquarters is at Juneau, the State's capital—and an agency of the Forest Service.

However, we are dedicating more than a building, a fine building both practical and utilitarian, as well as architecturally attractive and in harmony with its surroundings both natural and man-made, for which the Forest Service, the university and the community are indebted to our locally resident, but already nationally recognized architect, Lee Linck, who was able to rely for the assurance that his design would be adequately materialized on the local firm of contractors headed by Ken Wright. There is something in this for everybody and that something is good.

But there is, I say, something more here than an edifice. We are also dedicating a venture, a prospect, and an investment; respectively a venture into knowledge of an area and of a resource therein in which to date almost no research has been done; we are dedicating a prospect of better utilization of that resource for the benefit of man, and therefore we are dedicating a more than self-liquidating investment by the Federal Government to make that great northern timber resource serve its maximum usefulness.

This venture is to be 1 of 10 such regional forestry experimental stations, actual or prospective, which are located in areas of diverse forestry resources. But I suggest that none other has quite the uniqueness and challenge of this northern outpost. It deals with a resource spread over an area of 120 million acres—an area larger than any of 48 of our 50 States. It deals with an area with the widest temperature fluctuations under the flag with recorded extremes of 100° Fahrenheit above and 76° below zero. It deals with an area which exhibits the widest alterations in exposure to sunlight in our country.

Finally the Laboratory will deal with a vast area that is virtually all in public ownership, Federal or maybe State, which precludes some of the limitations that exist in other heavily settled and densely populated areas.

So much for the broader geographic or spatial aspects of the Laboratory's mission. But there are no less significant factors related to time.

We are dedicating this Laboratory in an explosive age. We are hearing much of the population explosion which has a pertinence to the ever-increasing need of safeguarding and wisely utilizing our every natural resource.

We know of the political explosion of our time—sometimes of late referred to as the revolution of rising expectations. By that is meant the nationalistic awakenings and anticolonial revolts by the peoples of so-called backward and underdeveloped nations seeking a larger participation in the abundance and affluence which the more advanced peoples have wrought for themselves. Some, inclined to be cynical, view the so-called revolution of rising expectations as the expectation of more largesse from Uncle Sam and his foreign aid program. But the soundest part, in my view, of this Nation's foreign aid program has not been in the vast sums we have committed to foreign nations—now in excess of a hundred billion dollars—but in the education, the training,



the skills, the know-how we impart to enable peoples to fend for themselves. And that clearly implies that we ourselves must have learned what to do with our own resources and not commit and repeat the errors which our earlier inexperience and seemingly inexhaustible abundance caused us to commit.

But there is a third explosion related to the foregoing of no less moment of which this laboratory is an integral part. It is the scientific explosion. True, scientific groping was known to the ancients, but modern scientific research is probably no older than Sir Francis Bacon in the 16th century, who is credited with being its father and which was developed haltingly through the great pioneers in science such as Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, and in the last century by such immortals as Darwin and Pasteur. But it is really only in our own time that the fields of science have broadened both extensively and intensively, indeed exploded and brought forth such a plethora of new-found leads, insights, trails, and discoveries that today the greatest of all frontiers—research in science—beckons invitingly to the continued exploration and penetration of the mysteries of the cosmos. The forest laboratories are a part of this great surge to turn new light onto man's age-old natural inheritance.

There is also a local time factor that is pertinent. When Rampart Canyon Dam is authorized in the near future it will be necessary within the next decade or two to assess and start utilizing the considerable timber stands in the 11,000-square-mile area that will be flooded by the reservoir back of the dam. Here an almost immediate high priority assignment awaits the foresters particularly charged with the responsibility for Alaska's Arctic and subarctic. There will be need of the practical application on a microscopic scale of much that will have been learned here in the laboratory. The funds expended on research will be returned manifold into our State's and Nation's economy. (I would speak of the happy coincidence of the laboratory's establishment on the campus of the University of Alaska with the prospect of their close association in fields of common enterprise and concern. Research and teaching are closely related and I am hopeful that the interplay of these endeavors will become even more meaningful and more fruitful.)

A university—especially here where it is the State university—can and should embody and exalt the spirit of the State. It can and should supply much of its larger community's inspiration, guidance, and leadership.

The University of Alaska is destined to become not only a great center of research for all matters pertaining to the Arctic and subarctic but the only American institution of higher learning qualified by its location in the subarctic and on the edge of the Arctic to carry out successfully that tremendous assignment—an assignment which is important to the Nation and indeed to the whole world. For as the world's population increases it is inevitable that the hitherto sparsely inhabited regions of the earth will be invaded by man and settled. Research into the environment and ecology of this hitherto little studied region will facilitate that settlement and adaptation to this environment.

There is still another time factor that is pertinent. Alaska has just recently become a State—a scant 4½ years ago. It has inherited needs and problems from its 92-year colonial status. Here at the university with the heartening visible evidences of its dynamic growth is a concomitant of statehood. It has provided a great thrill for those of us who sensed the importance and need of this State university and saw it suffer under the financial difficulties against which Dr. Bunnell

struggled so gallantly—Dr. Bunnell, the first president and its president for 25 years, without whose dedicated and determined persistence the university would perhaps not exist today. The changed attitude toward the University of Alaska shown by the Alaska State Legislature—the really important agency since it is the source of most of the university's funds—is a gratifying by-product of statehood.

I regret to recall that in territorial days after the first great legislature in 1913, the absentee interests took over; their purpose and policy was to take out of Alaska as much as possible and to leave as little as they could. Indeed for the 92 years before statehood much was taken out and little put back by the political and economic forces that ruled Alaska from afar through their locally installed henchmen.

The Congress, where Alaska was for 53 years before statehood represented by only a voteless delegate in the House of Representatives was likewise wholly indifferent toward Alaska, when it was not downright discriminatory. It withheld from the University of Alaska funds that were its due as a land-grant college. It arbitrarily deprived the national forests of Alaska of some \$7 million to which they were entitled—not as an economy measure—but distributed these funds among other States having national forests, and votes, and while Alaska's national forests, the Tongass and the Chugach, were established here long before statehood owing to the pioneering vision of Gifford Pinchot, appropriations for their needs were kept at niggardly minimums. In fact I make so bold as to say that this facility we are dedicating today would not have come as long as Alaska remained a territory.

So you, who will participate in the work, the research, the functioning of this Forestry Sciences Laboratory are enlisted in a great adventure, an adventure to which time and place beckon. I congratulate you. You will be working in congenial company; in an environment of scholarship and high purpose. I wish you and the Laboratory which will be your workshop a creative, successful and happy future. You will be helping to build your national Forest Service, our university, our State and our Nation and contributing to the knowledge that mankind needs for its steady advance.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S SOUND VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday morning Assistant Secretary of State Hilsman briefed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with respect to the growing problems incident to current operations in South Vietnam.

Last Wednesday an editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat commended the policies of this administration with respect to that country, and because I believe in most if not all of the conclusions of this editorial, entitled "Mr. Kennedy's Sound Vietnam Policy," I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

##### MR. KENNEDY'S SOUND VIETNAM POLICY

The President has tackled the tough, abrasive problem in South Vietnam with good judgment and candor.

Unless there is an end to the autocratic influence some members of the Nhu family exert at Saigon, the guerrilla war against the China-backed Red Vietcong can never be won. Unless bayoneted violence against Buddhists stops, Vietnam will be lost.

That would mean the United States great stake in South Vietnam would disappear beneath quicksands of the little nation's wretched and stupid crisis.

More important, it would mean America and the West would have failed to halt the gunned encroachment of Asian Communists, driving to gobble all of southeast Asia.

In his statement Monday, Mr. Kennedy called for a change in policies, "perhaps personnel" of President Ngo Dinh Diem's regime, so the Government can regain popular support of the Vietnamese people.

Secondly, Mr. Kennedy declared it would be a "great mistake" to withdraw United States aid from the Vietnam struggle against Communist marauders from the north.

The President is right on both counts. Ngo Diem has apparently lost touch with his people since last May when Government troops and police broke up a demonstration in the city of Hue, where Buddhists wanted to fly their flag in a religious ceremony. Eight Buddhists were slain, 14 wounded.

Things have since gone from bad to worse, with charges of Buddhist persecution and discrimination, culminating in raids on Buddhist pagodas by the military.

Yet it would be folly now for America to haul out of Vietnam, with our forces of more than 14,000 and our billions in military assistance.

That would simply leave Vietnam a beckoning vacuum for the Vietcong and power-hungry Red China.

Though the President did not spell out Vietnam policy in precise language, it is known the administration believes President Diem may recoup an effective Saigon rule, if he can free himself of his powerful brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, and Nhu's officious, more powerful wife, Madame Nhu.

These two characters, brilliant, despotic, and controlling the secret police, are probably at the bottom of Buddhist oppression.

President Diem, a Catholic, denies any religious discrimination. But the conduct of his brother and sister-in-law has caused a bitter division among the people. This must be halted, the ugly breach spanned by new, moderate, and equitable policies.

Mr. Kennedy obviously hopes Diem can shuck his brother and Madame Nhu from Government and form a competent, popular regime.

Diem is still highly respected in South Vietnam; his brother is feared. Buddhists form 70 percent of the population. Diem's Vice President, more than half the Cabinet ministers, the commander of the armed forces, and most of his senior generals are Buddhists.

During the 8 hectic years of his administration, President Diem established a government, a national assembly, and constitution which were really working until recently. He built roads, new schools, inaugurated land reforms, and created the Vietnam army, equipped by the United States. The economy was beginning to flourish. He had built the country from virtual chaos, absorbing 1 million immigrants from North Vietnam.

His ability and capacity, which seem ruthlessly undercut by a scheming brother and the ambitious Madame Nhu, could still be directed toward binding up the wounds of his mangled state. This apparently is what Mr. Kennedy seeks to promote. There is no other leader available.

But to function in the patriotic interests of his country and stave off the Communist aggression, Diem must be liberated from the activities of brother and sister-in-law, whose marplot designs, abetted by Communist subversion in Saigon, have all but destroyed Diem and his original programs.

For these reasons, we are convinced the CIA has not plotted—as charged yesterday in a Saigon newspaper—to overthrow the whole Diem rule.

President Kennedy and veteran Ambassador Lodge have a hard, Red row in Vietnam. The President's approach seems realistic and right. We deeply hope it succeeds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, with respect to which there is a limitation of debate of 30 minutes on any amendment, motion, or appeal, and 1 hour on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time necessary for the quorum call being charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require, under the unanimous-consent agreement, from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 11, after the word "following", it is proposed to strike out

*Provided*, That no allowances shall be paid to any such youth who drops out of school, for a period of three months after the date of dropout.

And insert:

*Provided*, That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than three months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate

local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we know what the Senate is doing?

Mr. CLARK. I have asked to incorporate the committee amendments, so that the Senate can consider the bill as it came from the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. It is understood, Mr. President, that the amendments will be incorporated as original text?

I have amendments to offer, and other Senators have amendments.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc; and the bill, as so amended, will be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need on the bill.

S. 1831 is a companion measure to S. 1716, which was passed by the Senate on Wednesday of this week. Both bills incorporate amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, recommended by the President to the Congress. Both bills are of some assistance in the upgrading of the labor skills of minority groups.

In his message of June 19 President Kennedy made certain recommendations "designed to improve the training, skills, and economic opportunities of the economically distressed and discontented, white and Negro alike."

He further recommended amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act "not only to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements, but also—in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment—to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youths, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program."

S. 1831 incorporates each of these proposals.

First, it provides for training in reading, writing, and arithmetic, as well as manual training in the use of tools, for those of the unemployed who are unable to take occupational training courses because they lack these skills.

Second, it provides for expansion of the youth training program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 16.

Third, it increases the percentage of funds available for the youth training program from 5 percent of the estimated total training allowances to 15 percent.

The bill authorizes additional annual appropriations of \$100 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, in order to meet the cost of the expanded program.

The need for this bill arises from the fact that there are 3 million workers in our labor force today who can neither read nor write. Eight hundred thousand, or more than one-quarter of them, are unemployed. Perhaps as many as 25 percent of unemployed illiterates are Negroes.

In the first year of the Manpower Development and Training Act program eight applicants were rejected for every trainee accepted in the program. Many of them were rejected because they could neither read nor write, or had no knowledge of elementary mathematics, principally arithmetic.

In other words, they did not even have knowledge of the three R's, and yet, in order to be a gas station attendant today, one has to be able to handle a charge account; he has to be able to write out a bill; he has to be able to add and subtract; he also has to be able to do a little simple multiplication. A taxi driver has to be able to read road signs and his meter. He has to be able to make change. But 300,000 of our unemployed are unable to perform these elementary acts; and these are the hard core of the unemployed.

In addition to teaching the three R's under this bill, there would be training in how to use basic tools common to many occupations.

An interesting bit of testimony was that of Secretary of Labor Wirtz, who told the committee of an instance in which 500 women were interviewed recently in one public employment office before 30 were found to fill a class in practical nursing. In order to line up 20 trainees for hotel and restaurant cooks, 287 persons had to be interviewed. Many of those rejected were rejected because they could not read the simple instructions needed to carry on the occupation; others because they could not do the simple exercises in writing necessary to fulfill their job; still others because, as I have said, they could not add, subtract, or divide.

Under normal circumstances, those who will receive literacy training under the bill would have been applicants for ordinary occupational training in a manpower development and training course, but were rejected, because they could not read, write, or figure.

It is important that the intent of the literacy training program should not be confused with the normal instruction we expect of our educational system. We are speaking, by and large, of teaching older heads of households who must have some source of income while they learn the basic educational skills essential to obtain employment. We are talking for the most part about the 45-year-old unemployed coal miner and those who share his lot. The statistics on illiteracy among our unemployed reflect this: In March 1962, about only 4 out of 10 of workers 45 to 64 years of age had completed high school, compared to 6 out of 10 of those 35 to 44, and almost 7 out of 10 of those 18 to 44.

While the bill, for the sake of flexibility, permits literacy courses to run for as long as 52 weeks, Commissioner Keppel advised the subcommittee that the



normal instruction period will last from 4 to 6 months. Of the \$100 million which would be authorized additionally under the bill, it is expected that \$50 million will be allocated to the functional illiteracy program provided by the bill, and that 50,000 literacy-deficient unemployed can be trained at that cost.

I turn now briefly to the parts of the bill dealing with youth. The bill would lower from 19 to 16 the age limit for training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and it would increase the share of the training cost which may be allocated to youth.

Between January and June of this year a net increase of 400,000 unemployed between 14 and 19 entered the labor force. Only 100,000 of them got jobs. The remaining 300,000 were added to the unemployed. The unemployment rate for teenagers was 18 percent for boys and 19.3 percent for girls, compared to the national average of 5.6 percent.

It is important to note that these are young people looking for work they cannot get; and that of all the unemployed in 1962, 15.6 percent were under 19 years. Yet under the first year of the Manpower Development and Training Act, only 4.3 percent of the first 22,500 workers were under 19.

In making this change, the Senate is not being asked to do anything new. The age limit was brought down to 16 when the Manpower Development and Training Act was passed in 1962. The House raised the age limit, and in conference we accepted the House figure. In passing the pending bill, which I hope the Senate will do, it will be merely going back to the provision of the bill which the Senate passed last year.

Some concern was expressed that the training courses for young people might encourage them to drop out of school in order to receive training with pay. This matter was fully explored by the subcommittee with Dr. Keppel, the Commissioner of Education. We feel that we have eliminated the possibility of young people moving into training courses in order to receive pay for training while completing their education, by providing that before they can qualify they must have been out of school for 3 months of the school year, consecutively. In other words, they cannot quit school during vacation time, for a full 3 months, and then go back to school. They must really have dropped out of school and be bona fide seekers of jobs in the labor force, or they will not qualify under the act.

There was a good deal of discussion as to whether the period should be increased to 6 months in order to further discourage people from dropping out of school in order to take these courses.

It was the consensus of opinion of the large majority of the subcommittee members, based on Dr. Keppel's recommendations, that 3 months was about the right figure. No one can be sure, of course, but that was our view after looking into the subject quite carefully.

The other \$50 million authorized under the program would go for the adult training to which I have referred earlier. Therefore, between the adult training for literacy and the expanded youth pro-

gram, the appropriation requested would be split 50-50. I should point out that when we increase the percentage of the number of youth who can be trained under the bill from the 5 percent presently incorporated in the law to 15 percent, as called for by S. 1831, we are doing more than tripling the number of young people who can be trained. This is because the training allowance for young people under the act cannot exceed \$20 a week, and is presently averaging at \$17 a week, because it is fixed at one-half of the unemployment compensation payment made in the particular State.

When we triple the percentage of the youths who can be trained, we more than increase the actual number, because the money involved is less for the young people than it is for the older people.

I believe that adequately explains the purpose of the bill. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many persons have been trained under the act?

Mr. CLARK. About 60,000 have been or are now being trained at the rate of 108,000 a year. The program was smaller, of course, in its earlier months.

Mr. ELLENDER. What success have they had in obtaining jobs?

Mr. CLARK. Of those who have completed the courses, 70 percent have obtained jobs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who does the training?

Mr. CLARK. The training is done in several ways. The largest number of trainees are being trained through the local school boards and local educational systems, largely, but not entirely, through vocational and technical schools.

Mr. ELLENDER. In schools established by the States?

Mr. CLARK. In schools established by the States, or by the local school districts. Some training is done under so-called on-the-job training in industry.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of this money is used to pay the student while he is in training?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be glad to obtain that information for the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood the Senator a moment ago to say that some of the trainees are getting as much as \$17 a week, and that perhaps the amount will be raised to \$20 a week. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. No, the Senator misunderstood me. The training allowances for the young people are lower than the training allowances for older people. The act fixed the young people's training allowance at one-half of the unemployment compensation payment in the particular State in which they reside. However, there is a ceiling of \$20 a week above which they cannot go. In practice it has amounted to approximately \$17. The payments are different in the various States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is that being paid at all?

Mr. CLARK. In order to permit them to live while they are receiving training.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the same thing apply to young people who live with their parents?

Mr. CLARK. These people, in order to qualify for a course, must be classified as unemployed. They must be individuals who are looking for work that they cannot find. This quite low training allowance has been paid during the past year with substantial success, in order to keep them in groceries, so to speak, while they are taking training. Otherwise, they would be out attempting to find jobs for which they are not trained. They would have dropped out of school, and in many instances would live with their families. In many more instances they are not living at home, because they come from broken homes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can understand that with respect to children 16 to 18 years of age. Are any additional payments made to any of the students who live away from the school where they are being trained?

Mr. CLARK. Not for the young people; only for the older people. That subject was under discussion. It was quite controversial. We decided not to include such a provision.

Mr. ELLENDER. The payment is made irrespective of the distance that the students live away from the school they attend. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the maximum amount paid to an illiterate who has been doing work in a coal mine, for example, and who has reached the age of 25 or more?

Mr. CLARK. Under the bill he would be entitled, while he was being trained, to the amount of the unemployment compensation which the particular State in which he lives would have awarded to him if he had a job and had lost it. Of course they cannot double up. If he is getting unemployment compensation when he starts his training, he would not get an additional allowance.

Mr. ELLENDER. The entire cost of the program is borne by the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What portion of the money is used to pay the schools where the trainees study?

Mr. CLARK. I can best put it this way: In the adult training program, the average training allowance per trainee—that is the money he is paid to live on—

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not mean that. We have settled that point.

Mr. CLARK. This goes back to the Senator's previous question. The estimated average training allowance for each trainee is \$625 for the older people.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the entire course?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. The courses differ in length, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. CLARK. Some courses are longer than others. The average course costs \$625. The training cost, which is the rest of the expense, and which goes to compensate the school district or employer, was \$402. Therefore, roughly, 60

percent goes for training allowance and 40 percent for the cost of the program. That is, roughly, about \$1,000 per trainee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The schools receive about \$240?

Mr. CLARK. About \$402. It is roughly \$600 for the individual and \$400 for the school.

Mr. ELLENDER. The entire cost is around \$1,000?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. For the young people it is different.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are contracts entered into by the schools for a certain period during which students are to attend?

Mr. CLARK. The way the program works is this: The State employment service in Louisiana will recommend, in coordination with the local school system—usually the vocational school system—a series of training courses to run for various periods of time. They must certify that if that training course is instituted and completed, the trainee will have a reasonable opportunity to obtain gainful employment.

That plan, jointly worked out by the school district and the State employment service, must then be submitted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington to be screened and approved. Once it has been approved, it is returned, and the money to pay for it is authorized to be paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that under such a plan the time necessary to train the person or persons is the decisive factor?

Mr. CLARK. It is carefully worked out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the amount of the fee for the service that is paid by the Federal Government to the school is determined by the length of time required to teach the students?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Likewise, the amount of allowances made to the students is determined in advance, depending on the length of the course?

Mr. CLARK. They are weekly payments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Irrespective of the length of the course?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. It is one-half of whatever the unemployment compensation rate is in Louisiana. I do not know what that rate is. The trainee receives that sum for the number of weeks he takes the course. If he took a course for 6 weeks, he would get half the amount for 6 weeks. If he took a course for 48 weeks, he would get half the compensation for 48 weeks.

Mr. ELLENDER. In all events, HEW would settle the number of months or weeks that are required to teach the students in certain professions; and the amount of compensation that would be allowed the schools would be fixed in advance. Then the payment or allowance would depend on what the State paid in compensation?

Mr. CLARK. That is almost correct, but not entirely. The plan comes up from below. All HEW does is to make certain it is a good plan. Either it will

approve it or will say, "We do not like it; we think you ought to change it." But the plan is worked out in Pennsylvania or Louisiana by the State employment service and the local school system.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it is based upon the requirements of the act?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. The operation is decentralized.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much has been spent to date on the program?

Mr. CLARK. A little more than \$70 million has been committed. The appropriation was not made until August of last year. It was several months after that before the program could be established.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is proposed this year to increase the amount to \$100 million more?

Mr. CLARK. One hundred million dollars a year more, because of the new programs under the act—that is, the functional literacy program and the expanded youth program—and the purpose is to split \$100 million 50-50 between those two programs. But this is an expanded program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The authorization is for \$100 million a year?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield; but first I wish to ask the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I shall have to ask the Senator to take the time of the opposition.

Would the Senator from New York yield time to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the absence of the minority leader, and because I am the ranking member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the Chamber at the moment, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I have only two questions. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that the main thrust of the bill is to provide literacy type training for adults who are supporting families?

Mr. CLARK. No. There are three purposes in the bill. One of them is the literacy training program, which the Senator has mentioned; the second is the youth program, in which the age limit is reduced from 19 years to 16; and the third—really a part of the second—is to increase the percentage share of training allowances for young people in the program from 5 percent to 15 percent. But there are two main forks—the youth program and the adult literacy program.

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to have that point cleared up, because while the Senator pointed out the objectives of the bill, I thought he laid stress on the adult training program.

Mr. CLARK. I did not intend to.

Mr. MILLER. My second question is this: Surely the Senator recognizes that it is important to keep young people in school, and that they must be encouraged

not to drop out. But does it not seem to the Senator as though the requirement set forth on page 2 is a little weak, so far as reducing the adverse possibility to the maximum degree? The bill merely provides that none of the high school dropouts or persons of that age can qualify unless they have been out of school for 3 months. It seems to me that all that is necessary for them to do is to drop out for 3 months—granted there will be guidance and counsel by the appropriate authorities—and then they can receive training for 52 weeks.

Has the Senator considered enlarging the period from 3 months to perhaps 1 year, or even 2 years, so that students will drop out at that peril? I think the program ought not to be subject to the criticism which has been advanced in the minority views to the effect that the proposal in the bill will encourage dropouts. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania does not want the bill to be used as a vehicle for encouraging dropouts.

Mr. CLARK. The committee gave careful consideration to this question. A number of members of the subcommittee interrogated Commissioner of Education Keppel and Secretary of Labor Wirtz carefully on this subject. It was the mature conviction of a large majority of the committee that the 3 months period set forth in the act was about right. Nobody can be certain. There was not a single member of the committee who thought that a person should have the benefit of this course 1 year after he had dropped out of school because he had to help his family earn a living or had to earn a living himself. Certainly no one in his wildest imagination thought of 2 years. There was some discussion as to whether a 6 months period would be better than a 3 months period. Nobody knows. But the expert testimony which we heard from the Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of Education satisfied the committee that the provision written into the bill was somewhat stronger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CLARK. I shall read the provision:

*Provided, That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than three months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.*

In other words, that is how the educators feel. That is what the people who are dealing with juvenile delinquency think. That is what the committee concluded was correct.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. Perhaps 3 months would be all right, provided something else were included, that is, that the continuity of dropout shall be due to the necessity of helping to support the fam-



ily of the individual concerned. But no such safeguard is written into this language. I would go along with what the Senator has said, but it is not set forth in the bill. I believe that something such as I have suggested would be helpful to the bill.

Mr. CLARK. With all deference to the Senator from Iowa, the situation in his State is different from that in mine. The youngsters who would be trained under this program in my State come from broken families. They do not have homes; they are on the streets. That is not the case in Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. There are broken homes in my State, too. I still believe we ought to provide safeguards in the bill, so that deliberate dropouts will be prevented and the people will not take improper advantage of the act. Those safeguards are not written into the bill. A provision should be devised which would not interfere with the overall thrust of the legislation.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I have no further time in which to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]; thereafter, I shall yield time to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for yielding this time to me.

Let me say I believe this a very important question.

I have an amendment which requires that there be absence during a 6-month period during the regular school year before the student will be eligible to participate in the program.

Dr. Keppel, the Commissioner of Education, expressed serious doubt as to whether the 3-month period presently called for in the bill will work. He believes that it may work or that it may not work.

I should like to quote from the statement made by Fred Z. Hetzel, Director of the U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia:

However, we feel that such allowances should not be paid to any youth who has been separated from school for less than 6 months. This provision would greatly diminish any desire on the part of some of these youths to deliberately drop out of school in order to get weekly allowances from a Manpower Development and Training Act program.

I think that is true, particularly now that we are reducing the age from 19 to 16. In my opinion, a youngster who ordinarily would commence school this week or next week would be perfectly willing to wait 3 months, in the hope that then he could receive up to \$20 a week as a result of taking the program.

So later I shall offer my amendment to change the period from 3 months to 6 months.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, my question will deal with the same subject. I should like to address it to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I preface my remarks by stating that in my hometown of Somerset, Ky., there is a vocational school; and not long ago I talked to its administrator, who told me that continuously there are approximately 400 persons who take training in it, and that one of the tragic things he has found is the existence of a large number of young people who are not literate and do not have the basic educational requirements even to undertake that training. So I am sympathetic with this approach.

In considering the proposal to make eligibility dependent upon failure to attend classes for a period of 3 months, I must say that I agree with the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Iowa. I believe this provision would be a great inducement to these young people to leave school; the temptation to do that and to receive the payments would be too great.

I wonder whether it would be best to require absence for one school year, with the further provision that if the Secretary or the Commissioner found the existence of certain other circumstances, such as the dire need by the family or some other affirmative condition, he could waive that requirement. The Secretary would certainly waive it if some unusual circumstance came into play.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. May I have half a minute more?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I do not claim to have full experience in this field, but I have served as a local official and as a juvenile court judge, and I know how difficult it is to keep young people in school. If there is an inducement for them to leave, they will leave.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that neither the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] nor I was consulted about the time allocation, which is quite short. So I should like to have an understanding with the Senator from Pennsylvania that if we have any problems about the time, we shall request unanimous consent for an additional hour on the bill. I hope very much he will not object.

Mr. CLARK. I would be prepared to respond right now to such a request, but neither the majority leader nor the minority leader is here.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall not request it unless we really need it.

Mr. CLARK. Let me respond to the Senator from Kentucky: Secretary Wirtz testified before the subcommittee that he thought the 3-month waiting period

was about correct. Senators understand that no part of a vacation period can be counted as part of the 3-month period, which must be 3 months while school is in session. When Commissioner Keppel came before the subcommittee, I asked his judgment as an educator on the 3-month period. He said:

I don't think we have a body of experience that can tell us that 3 months is better than 4, or 5 months is better than 6.

I would hope that the Congress might be willing to let us go at it at 3 months and, if we find that the magnet is too close to the pin and it is having the negative effect on school holding power, to come back and propose revisions in that. Let me put it this way sir: In my judgment as an educator, I do not think that 3 months presents—to misuse Justice Holmes' language—a clear and present danger—I do not think so, sir.

The committee took the judgment of that professional educator. I do not know that he is correct; but certainly I do not know that he is wrong.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am not a professional educator; but at one time I did have some slight experience as a juvenile court judge, and had to deal with the problem of school attendance. It was my experience that if a student dropped out for a whole school year, even though every effort was made by the authorities and by his parents to persuade him to stay in school, and if after a year he still had no interest in attending school, the effort usually became rather hopeless.

I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who is a member of the committee, that a school year should be the standard. But if the Secretary or those delegated by him decided that some special circumstances were applicable, the youngster could then be permitted to enter the program.

However, I believe this provision, as it appears in the bill before us, would be an inducement to the students to drop out of school.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee 1 minute of my remaining 6 minutes.

Mr. GORE. In the report I notice the reference to the purpose of the bill—namely, to protect against the possibility of purposeful dropouts from regular school in order to receive the stipends for training proposed under the pending bill. The committee report does not seem to me to spell out in satisfactory detail these safeguards. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania point them out?

Mr. CLARK. On page 2 of the bill is a proviso which stiffens to a certain extent the original proposal of the administration.

It reads as follows:

Provided, That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend

school classes for a period of not less than three months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.

In addition, the program will train only 50,000 young people a year. The fact is that 36 million youngsters will enter the work force in the 1960's. Among those will be 7½ million school dropouts, at least one-half of whom will be 16 or over. So that between now and the end of 1965 there will be 5½ million new entrants into the working force. Of these 2 million will be school dropouts. With those safeguards in the bill it seemed to the committee, based on the opinions given by Dr. Keppel, Commissioner of Education, and Secretary of Labor Wirtz, that with the 3 months' waiting period and the additional requirements of the Secretary being satisfied, there was very little prospect that a youngster would drop out of school in order to get this money for training allowance, or that the program would be abused.

Mr. GORE. What is the stipend?

Mr. CLARK. It is one-half of the weekly unemployment compensation payment for the State in which the trainee resides.

Mr. GORE. Which on a national average is what?

Mr. CLARK. It is about \$17 a week. One could not get rich on that.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand that there may be a shortage of available time on the bill. That deficiency could be cured by adding to the time available on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent order entered on the bill be modified so that 2 hours of debate will be available on the bill instead of 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds. I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had without the time necessary for the call being charged to either side. I intend to offer an amendment I have had printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 186, as modified, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC.—. (a) So much of the second sentence of section 203(a) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 as precedes the proviso at the end thereof is amended to read as follows: "Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks, and the amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed an amount equal to 50 per centum of the average weekly manufacturing wage (according to the most recent data available) in the State making such payment or in the United States, whichever is lower:"

(b) (1) The first sentence of the second paragraph of such section 203(a) is amended by striking out "the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payment during the most recent quarter for which such data are available" and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount of his weekly training allowance as determined under the preceding paragraph".

(2) The second sentence of such paragraph is amended by striking out "the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above" and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount of his weekly training allowance as referred to above".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. The purpose of the amendment is to reconcile the policy of the United States with the existing needs of this country.

It has been noted already that the standard of compensation for adult trainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act is today based upon unemployment compensation. We are not now talking about youth and the special provisions made in the bill for youth. I have not touched upon that subject in my amendment. The compensation for adult trainees is today based upon unemployment compensation.

That results in the following situations:

First, trainees do not get sufficient allowances to live on. Hence, there is a rate of dropouts of about 23 percent among participating trainees. Since the trainees do not get sufficient compensation to continue, no matter how bad is the first job that comes along, they grab it because they have no alternative. When they do that, all of the money which the United States has invested in their training is, in substance, wasted, and the national purpose is not attained.

Reason No. 1, therefore, is that the dropouts total in excess of one-fifth of those enrolling in the program. That is the testimony before the committee. That is directly attributable to the fact that the training allowances are inadequate. They are inadequate because they are based on unemployment compensation. I shall discuss those figures later.

The standard which I propose is 50 percent of the average manufacturing

wage in the particular State or in the United States, whichever is the lower. That would mean if my amendment should prevail, that in 19 of the 50 States the allowance would be 50 percent of the national average, because in those States the State average manufacturing wage is higher. In the other 31 States the training allowance would amount to 50 percent of the State average manufacturing wage.

On the whole, the amendment would result in increasing present allowances by an amount in the area of 25 to 30 percent. It would result in an additional cost to the Federal Government of something in the area of \$20 million, or perhaps a little less, in view of the fact that my calculation at the figure of one-half of the average State manufacturing wage came to about \$23 million, and I have now put on a ceiling affecting 19 States, which would rather materially reduce that aggregate amount.

Point No. 1 is that there is a very high rate of dropouts, for financial reasons, which makes the program self-defeating, because those who are being trained lose the benefit of their training because they cannot participate for the time necessary to complete the training.

The second point is that the internal operations of our Government are completely inconsistent in this important area. There are three programs under which there are allowances to trainees. This is one program. The Area Redevelopment Act is another. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is the third. Under each of those programs there are trainee allowances. Under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 the training allowance is based upon the standard which I propose; that is, the average manufacturing wage in the State. Under the Area Redevelopment Act the standard is based on unemployment compensation. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, which the Senate is considering today, the standard again is based on unemployment compensation.

An individual trainee trained under one of these acts, rather than under another, would receive a different standard of compensation from that provided under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. So the second reason for acting in the way which I propose is the fact that the programs inherently and internally are inconsistent.

The third reason is the nature of the program itself. We are trying to change the status of a man who will be displaced by automation or otherwise disadvantaged because he lacks training by giving him training to improve his capabilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes from the time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. We seek to raise such a man to a level of capability as to permit him to fulfill his role in the United States in the national interest. The program works in two ways. An individual will



perform his economic role by producing to his maximum potential, if he is retrained. He will also rehabilitate himself as a working unit in terms of himself and his family.

In order to do this, we do not wish to stamp a man as being unemployed. He is not unemployed. He is working for the benefit of the Nation as well as for the benefit of himself, in giving himself, because of national concern, a new opportunity in life and a new opportunity to contribute to the Nation. He should not have an unemployment psychology while he is so engaged. Yet, when we fix a standard of compensation for him which is based upon unemployment compensation we say exactly that. We say, "You are still unemployed. This is a kind of an extension of the unemployment situation, for you are still an unemployed man. You are not a man employed in training."

That is the concept which is important to understand for our country and for the purpose of making this whole effort and this whole program meaningful, as it should be.

The fourth and final argument is that the standard which is now set results in completely unrealistic allowances for trainees. For example, those allowances are as low as \$22.72 in Arkansas, \$25.30 in Alabama, \$24.99 in South Carolina, \$23.05 in Maine, and \$23.50 in Mississippi. I am speaking of the weekly rates. Even in the important industrial States, the figure is \$32.32 in Pennsylvania and \$37.69 in New York.

When we realize what the allowances for adult trainees, as contained in the law, amount to we realize it is not possible for such persons to live on these allowances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table of the actual weekly allowances which are being paid under the Manpower Development and Training Act, based upon the third quarter of the fiscal year 1963, may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, along with a comparison with the proposed allowances based on 50 percent of the average manufacturing wage, the ceiling I have proposed in my amendment.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—Comparison of present training allowance under Manpower Development and Training Act with proposed allowance of 50 percent of manufacturing earnings

State	Weekly MDTA allowance, 3d quarter, 1963	Proposed allowance of 50 percent of manufacturing wage	Amount of increase
Alabama.....	\$26	\$42	+\$16
Alaska.....	41		
Arizona.....	32	\$52	+\$20
Arkansas.....	24	33	+\$9
California.....	43	\$56	+\$13
Colorado.....	43	\$54	+\$11
Connecticut.....	39	\$52	+\$13
Delaware.....	38	49	+\$11
District of Columbia.....	38		
Florida.....	28	41	+\$13
Georgia.....	28	36	+\$8
Guam.....			
Hawaii.....	39		
Idaho.....	39	47	+\$8
Illinois.....	40	\$53	+\$13
Indiana.....	32	\$54	+\$22
Iowa.....	32	\$51	+\$19

TABLE I.—Comparison of present training allowance under Manpower Development and Training Act with proposed allowance of 50 percent of manufacturing earnings—Continued

State	Weekly MDTA allowance, 3d quarter, 1963	Proposed allowance of 50 percent of manufacturing wage	Amount of increase
Kansas.....	\$38	\$53	+\$15
Kentucky.....	33	46	+\$13
Louisiana.....	31	48	+\$17
Maine.....	25	39	+\$14
Maryland.....	32	48	+\$16
Massachusetts.....	39	45	+\$6
Michigan.....	37	\$61	+\$24
Minnesota.....	31	\$51	+\$20
Mississippi.....	25	33	+\$8
Missouri.....	34	48	+\$14
Montana.....	32	\$52	+\$20
Nebraska.....	32	47	+\$15
Nevada.....	39	\$61	+\$22
New Hampshire.....	32	38	+\$6
New Jersey.....	40	\$51	+\$11
New Mexico.....	31	45	+\$14
New York.....	39	48	+\$9
North Carolina.....	23	34	+\$11
North Dakota.....	33	44	+\$11
Ohio.....	42	\$57	+\$15
Oklahoma.....	27	\$45	+\$18
Oregon.....	36	\$52	+\$16
Pennsylvania.....	34	48	+\$14
Puerto Rico.....	15		
Rhode Island.....	32	41	+\$9
South Carolina.....	27	35	+\$8
South Dakota.....	31	49	+\$18
Tennessee.....	25	39	+\$14
Texas.....	30	48	+\$18
Utah.....	38	\$54	+\$16
Vermont.....	32	41	+\$9
Virginia.....	28	39	+\$11
Virgin Islands.....			
Washington.....	33	\$56	+\$23
West Virginia.....	24	51	+\$27
Wisconsin.....	42	\$52	+\$10
Wyoming.....	45	49	+\$4

NOTE.—Average weekly manufacturing wage in the United States as of July 1963 is \$99.88, as reflected in U.S. Department of Commerce Survey of Current Business, August 1963. The asterisks indicate States in which the proposed allowance of 50 percent of the manufacturing wage exceeds 50 percent of the U.S. manufacturing wage.

Mr. JAVITS. When we examine those figures we see that in absolute terms it is for all practical purposes impossible for the head of the household to make a living or even to get along on a minimum standard on the basis of the compensation which he would get under the act.

For all those reasons, Mr. President, I think it is essential that we face realistically the results of what we are trying to do in the interests of the Nation. Now, in my opinion, we are cheating, by dealing with the situation of retraining as if it were unemployment. It is not fair to the Nation, and it is not fair to the people concerned to do so.

I wish to refer to the testimony of Seymour L. Wolfbein, Director of the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training of the U.S. Department of Labor; to the testimony of Walter Reuther, head of the industrial division, AFL-CIO, as well as of the United Automobile Workers; and to the testimony of Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the department of legislation, AFL-CIO—before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—bearing out the concept which I am putting before the Senate in the amendment.

These witnesses, particularly Messrs. Reuther and Biemiller, recommended two-thirds of the wage rate for the job for which the worker is being trained rather than one-half of the average manufacturing wage, as I have laid it be-

fore the Senate, but the principle which is involved is the same. It is the principle that we should try to attain a standard of employment rather than unemployment, in the compensation which we pay trainees, thereby really giving the trainee the feeling that he is entitled to have—that he is engaged in a constructive effort, in an affirmative effort, rather than merely being unemployed and receiving unemployment compensation, which is all the present law gives him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes more from the time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. The rate of dropouts, coupled with the character of the program which needs to be carried out in our national interest, couple with the effect upon the individual being trained, and the fact that there is complete inconsistency, among the laws of the United States, together with the support of the witnesses I have described, indicates to me, as we are now revising this act, the need to amend it in the way I have suggested.

I am thoroughly in favor of what is being done by the bill. I feel that it is extremely sound and constructive that the Government is addressing itself to a fundamental duty, which is to see that hardship does not fall on an individual because of a readjustment in our country which is not the fault of that individual. That is laudable. The question is, What are the terms under which we are going to do it? I think this is one of the terms which is wrong, so far as both the individual and the Nation are concerned. It is for that reason that I pressed this amendment in committee, and why I press it now.

I feel this is a deserving amendment and should be passed by the Senate, but no matter what we may do here today, I feel that we cannot get away from a situation in which the rate of dropouts is going to compel material improvement in training allowances. The thing for the Government to do is not to wait until it is hit over the head by some disastrous failure of the program, but to anticipate what it sees clearly written in the sky by the kind of legislation which it writes.

As we are reforming the act in very desirable respects, let us reform it by what I seek to do by this amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I have great ideological sympathy with the position advanced by the Senator from New York. It may well be that when we have greater experience with the training allowances under the Manpower Training and Development Act, the administration will want to come before the committee and ask to have the allowances increased more or less along the lines which the Senator from New York has suggested. But we do not have enough experience under the act now to

know what the best answers are to the problem of training allowances, which are probably too low.

The position which I think a strong majority of the committee would have taken had the amendment been brought to a vote in the committee would be to go along with the administration, with the President's recommendations, for another year, and then, based on the testimony continually being taken by our committee as a whole, on the whole retraining program, determine whether we want to increase the allowances. I am quite certain the majority of the committee feels opposed to the amendment.

There are practical and technical objections to the amendment, also. The amendment would base compensation on the manufacturing wage in a particular State, but a very large proportion of the trainees are being trained for nonmanufacturing occupations, where the wage is lower. These exclusions are of occupations which are not included in the Fair Labor Standards Act—hotels, restaurants, laundry, small retail firms, where training courses will give opportunity for employment where persons are not now equipped with employable skills. In some cases the trainee would be getting training allowances in excess of the amount he could expect to earn in the occupation for which he was being trained.

There is another important pragmatic reason for objection to the amendment. The States have a great role to play in this program. It is true that a few days ago we provided that the Federal Government should pick up the whole tab for the program, but it is hoped that in the near future the States will be prepared to pay their share of the cost.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an instant?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand there are just enough Senators present to have the yeas and nays ordered on the amendment. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CLARK. The States have always wanted to base allowances on unemployment compensation. I do not think we should change that practically universal State desire for a new and untried training allowance procedure, as suggested by the Javits amendment.

It is true that the proposal would make available more opportunity for heads of households with higher aptitudes, but because it would increase competition for training, it would be more difficult to reach the hard core, less trainable individuals, whom we hope to get into jobs, even though paying less money than would be paid to more highly skilled workers.

For all these reasons I regretfully am compelled to oppose the amendment, and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In reference to the argument made by the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I

appreciate the Senator's feeling about this issue—I remind him that, if my memory serves me correctly, the amendment was proposed in the committee and rejected.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that the Senator withdrew it, reserving the right to offer it on the floor, but my memory may be wrong.

Mr. JAVITS. At any rate, the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator a table or some figures indicating the amount of money that is paid to people engaged in manufacturing work?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I put that table in the Record. I shall be happy to refer to any State the Senator has in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us take New York as compared to New Hampshire.

Mr. JAVITS. In New York today a trainee receives, as a maximum, \$39 a week. In New York, under the amendment, he could get a maximum of \$48 a week.

In New Hampshire a trainee receives \$32 a week as a maximum. Under the amendment which I have offered, he could get \$38 a week, if he were getting half of the average manufacturing wage.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the difference between the New York and New Hampshire rate, on a weekly basis, would be what?

Mr. JAVITS. Six or seven dollars a week, at a maximum.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about the State of Mississippi?

Mr. JAVITS. In the State of Mississippi he receives now a maximum of \$25 a week. Under the amendment I have offered, he would receive a maximum of \$33 a week. There is a difference of something in the area of 20 to 30 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice the Senator has increased the authorization from \$161 to \$184 million.

Mr. JAVITS. I struck that out of my amendment. I would like to tell the Senator why.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has only 1 minute left.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 3 minutes, 1 on the amendment, and 2 on the bill.

I struck out the authorization from the amendment because I felt if the amendment carried, a closer figure should be given and applied to the right section. The Senator will notice that the section of the bill which is amended by the bill itself increases the allowance by \$100 million for various purposes of the bill. The section which I had proposed to amend in my amendment went back to the original bill. I think there would be some confusion. So, in lieu of that, I gave estimates that the increase would be in the neighborhood of \$20 million. It was \$23 million as originally designed. That is one-half of the manufacturing wage. With the ceiling of it based on the average, it is reduced in 19 States,

and I therefore gave an approximation of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. In view of the fact that this program may cost \$20 to \$23 million more than the program being advocated, is it the intention of the Senator to increase the authorization?

Mr. JAVITS. I would, if my amendment should be agreed to. If it were adopted, I would move another amendment for that purpose.

This is a program that costs money. It is a program on which we are spending money in order to make it effective. My position is that if we want to make it effective, sooner or later—the Senator from Pennsylvania says later and I say sooner—we must face the issue. These allowances are premised upon a wrong standard. If it is worth doing it is worth doing right. If a Senator believes it is not worth doing at all, he should vote against the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am intrigued by the interesting argument made by the distinguished Senator from New York. I have also listened to the rebuttal made by the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill. What does the Senator from New York have to say with reference to the argument made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, that in some instances the amount of payment, being one-half of the manufacturing level in a community, could mean that an individual may be receiving almost as much money for training purposes as he would if he were employed?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe that is a valid argument. The Senator from Pennsylvania argued that we are training many people who are receiving more while they are being trained than they would if they had a job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes on the bill. The Senator argued that we may be training people for the service trade. It is true that the service trade wage averages somewhat less than the manufacturing wage average—however, not by as much as the Senator argues. I am drawing on my recollection, but this is a field with respect to which I have been keeping in close touch with what is going on. The average in the service trades is perhaps \$15 or \$20 less than the manufacturing wage. That still would not bring us down—this is a 50-percent figure, let us remember—to the point where it would be more attractive to take training than to have a job.

As the matter stands now, it is less attractive to take training than to have any job. One cannot make the grade in living expenses based upon the allowances which are being given. It is not being too generous to make it 50 percent of the manufacturing wage, because we are dealing with heads of families, or heads of households, under the Internal Revenue Act. There is no great romance in this matter if the Senate takes my standard, but it is a material improvement. Instead of waiting for



this program to break down, let us anticipate the breakdown and give the program the best chance of success that we can give it.

I believe my amendment is very important. I want the program to succeed. I believe a 20-percent dropout would kill the program. I am trying to take time by the forelock. I do not want to wait and be told that the program has failed. Let us do something now to keep the people in the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Pennsylvania in order to clarify a question that I asked him a short time ago.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago the distinguished Senator stated that under this program 60,000 unemployed had been trained.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is approximately correct. The figure is a little less than 60,000 are being trained. I believe it is 58,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not under the program that we are discussing, but under the old program. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. The Javits amendment applies to the old program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The program that we are considering, as I understand it, is an entirely new program.

Mr. CLARK. Under the bill, but not under the proposed amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the bill it is an entirely new program as compared with what was done last year.

Mr. CLARK. It is an expanded program. It is not entirely new.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore when the Senator said 70,000 people were trained, it was under the original 1962 program.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. We would train more under the proposed program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator refers to the expanded program.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

I yield myself 2 minutes on the amendment.

I believe there are four reasons which could be summarized why we must oppose the amendment.

First, while there is a high dropout rate, the dropouts are getting jobs. There is no necessary conclusion that they are getting jobs, at least in part, outside of their training. If we have a high dropout rate it is at least an indication that the program is to some extent effective.

Second, the Secretary of Labor does not now think this rate is too low. He may decide later that it is. However, until he, in his position of some expertise, wants the allowance increased, I suggest that the Senate not oppose his judgment.

In the third place, the Javits amendment would cost \$20 million more than what is proposed under the bill. We have gone far enough in increasing the authorization, at least for the time being.

In the fourth place, basing the training allowance on manufacturing costs is unrealistic, and provides the wrong standard.

I have before me a list of the 20 principal occupations in which people are being trained. Among them are clerks, typists, stenographers, nurses' aids, practical nurses, waiters, waitresses, cooks, salespeople. I submit it is not realistic or intelligent, with apologies to my friends from New York, to base the training allowance on the manufacturing wage.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Why could not the same rationale be used for the program as under the Trade Expansion Act? If it is good in one instance, why does not the same principle apply?

Mr. CLARK. Because under the Trade Expansion Act most of the jobs are manufacturing jobs.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator does not know that for sure.

Mr. CLARK. We cannot export services.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 1 minute. The Senator from Rhode Island is exactly correct, because it is not what a man has been doing that he is being retrained to do. It is what he is going to do that he is being trained for. It is illogical to say that we will retrain him to do what he has been doing. I feel that there is an inconsistency in the law. It is my own judgment, and I state it unilaterally, that if the Senate does not do it now, the administration will come back to Congress in 6 months or a year and ask that we do something about it, with perhaps the same formula. If we want the program to succeed, the adoption of my suggestion is a necessary improvement for the hundred million people that we are trying to help.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we are talking about yielding a half minute and 15 seconds, as though time were the most precious thing in a body that is known for extended talk. Can we not talk for 5 minutes on this subject? Why are we constricted to yielding half a minute at a time?

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator wish me to yield him some time? I will be glad to yield him 5 minutes. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not wish to be pugnacious about it. Why must we have time peddled cut? I have sat here when Senators talked for 23 hours on trivia. I understand we have 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question. Are we talking about an individual who has been employed but who, through no fault of his own, and because of automation, has lost his job? Because he is a human being the Federal Government is interested in having him trained for another task.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. PASTORE. He has lost his job, and because he is unemployed he is entitled to unemployment compensation benefits anyway?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Instead of offering unemployment compensation benefits, we are saying, "We will give you an op-

portunity to become trained rather than to stay at home and wait until the end of the week to collect a check. If you will only cooperate, we will provide you with an opportunity to be trained for a new task to start in a new direction, which will be better than staying at home."

Are we not psychologically saying, "You are in a different category by being trained for a new job than you would be if you merely received unemployment compensation"? We are seeking to lift the morale of the individual and to have him apply his talents to new training.

Why should we not follow the suggestion of the Senator from New York? I am surprised that the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is an outstanding liberal and a farsighted man, should be opposed to this kind of amendment.

This situation strikes at the dignity of an individual who is willing to cooperate to learn another task because, through automation, he has lost a job he once had. All it amounts to is a pitance of \$5, \$6, or \$7 a week.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes to reply to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. If we are going to do something, let us do it on a dignified basis. Everyone knows that it is going to cost a little more money to preserve a program rather than to destroy it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I find myself in—

Mr. PASTORE. In a box?

Mr. CLARK. No, I do not find myself in a box at all. I find myself in the logical position where my head must necessarily take precedence over my heart. The Senator from Rhode Island makes a strong appeal to the heart-strings, due largely to the basis on which the Senator from New York makes the appeal.

But there is a large category of individuals outside the group about whom the Senator from Rhode Island is talking and who are intended to be covered by the bill. We are thinking in terms of a hard core of unemployed persons who have not been in the labor force for a long while, persons whose unemployment compensation has expired, and many of whom are on relief.

The high-grade, blue-collar worker, who once received a high wage, may be entitled, as the Senator from Rhode Island says, to more than unemployment compensation. But to use a manufacturing standard is to use an unrealistic standard.

Finally, we do not seek to help a large number of persons for whom the additional payment would not be an inducement to take the course, but for whom the payment they receive is adequate to induce them to take the course. It does not seem proper to charge a higher cost to the taxpayer at this time.

I appreciate, in terms of compassion, that the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from New York made a strong argument; but the proposal was carefully considered in committee and was carefully studied by the Secretary of Labor. It was determined that it would be better to proceed in this way for another year.

That is the full strength of my argument. If it does not convince the Senator from Rhode Island, I certainly will not quarrel with him. It is not an amendment which I should fight and bleed and die to defeat; but on balance, acting with my head, not with my heart, I believe it would be wiser to defeat the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. My only rejoinder to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is to compliment him on his standards. But I shall support the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his support. I hope that the policy of dignity by the United States toward those whom the proposal will help to train will be followed by the Senate. I am ready to vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 151 Leg.]

YEAS—10

Alken	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Case	Keating	Pell
Fong	Kennedy	
Javits	Nelson	

NAYS—60

Allott	Ervin	Miller
Bartlett	Goldwater	Monroney
Bayh	Gore	Morse
Beall	Hart	Muskie
Bible	Hayden	Pearson
Brewster	Hill	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Randolph
Cannon	Humphrey	Ribicoff
Carlson	Inouye	Robertson
Church	Johnston	Russell
Clark	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Cooper	Lausche	Smith
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Dirksen	Magnuson	Talmadge
Dominick	Mansfield	Thurmond
Douglas	McCarthy	Walters
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Edmondson	McGee	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—30

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Jackson	Neuberger
Boggs	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Burdick	Long, La.	Simpson
Cotton	McGovern	Smathers
Dodd	McIntyre	Sparkman
Engle	McNamara	Symington
Fulbright	Mechem	Tower
Gruening	Morton	Yarborough
Hartke	Moss	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, line 8, it is proposed to insert "who are over 35 years of age or who have neither completed the eighth grade of school nor otherwise acquired the educational equivalent of the eighth grade of school and" after "persons".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment is agreeable to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I can explain it very briefly. Originally it was my purpose to prevent anyone who had completed or had the equivalent of an eighth-grade education from being eligible for any activity under the so-called literacy program envisaged by the bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania suggested that there were probably some people in the country who had had the equivalent of an eighth-grade education but were 35 years of age or over, and therefore perhaps have been unable to keep up on their reading and writing. It seems to me that those people would be very few in number. So with that change in the amendment, I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania would be willing to accept it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont would eliminate from the program, if I correctly understand—and I ask the Senator if I do—anyone under 35 years of age who had been through 8 years of school. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. Or had the equivalent of 8 years of school.

Mr. CLARK. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont would not apply to older workers—those 35 years of age or over—regardless of how much schooling they had had.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I see no serious objection to the amendment. I have polled most of the members of the subcommittee. Therefore, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer a second amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the words "functional literacy" and insert in lieu thereof the words "elementary reading, writing and arithmetic".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.



Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is also agreeable to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not like the word "elementary." I understood that the amendment would merely refer to "reading, writing, and arithmetic." I would be prepared to accept an amendment to that effect, but when the word "elementary" is added, confusion might result. I hope that the Senator will be willing to withdraw the word "elementary" and make the language read "reading, writing, and arithmetic," in which case I would be happy to accept the amendment.

Terms such as "functional illiteracy" seem like gobbledygook. I like the simpler wording.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out the word "elementary" in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I accept the modified amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. One page 2, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "3" and insert in lieu thereof "6".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment would require that in order for a school dropout to be eligible to participate in the training program under the act, he must have been out of school for 6 months continuously during the regular school term. The bill would require a 3-month period for school dropouts. The longer period of 6 months would lessen any incentive which a potential school dropout might have to leave school in order to enter the program.

It seems to me that the last thing we would wish to do under the program would be to encourage any boy or girl to drop out of high school by reason of the fact that he or she would be entitled to an amount up to \$20 per week under the allowance program. It is extremely doubtful that a 3-month period would be sufficient to discourage many boys and girls who might have a tendency to or be thinking of leaving school. I think that would be most unfortunate. Dr. Keppel, the Commissioner of Education, expressed some concern about that particular question. He said, "We do not

know what will happen. If too many drop out, we can change the law."

But I think perhaps the time to do that is now. In its present form, the bill is superior to the act, which does not require any time limitation whatsoever. But I believe that a 6-month period is far more realistic than a 3-month period. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Let the Record show that the best judgment of the Commissioner of Education and the best judgment of the Secretary of Labor is that 3 months is a long-enough time to keep school dropouts out of these training courses. No one knows what the right period is. There is no experience. But the professional educators are of the view that it would be wiser to allow a youngster to start retraining if during the school year he had been out of school for 3 continuous months.

Vacation periods are not included. However, this must be in the realm of judgment and of speculation. After having conferred with the members of the subcommittee who are present in the Chamber, I am prepared to take the amendment to conference. Therefore, I will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for accepting the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. After line 17 on page 3, it is proposed to add the following new subsection:

(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, not more than 30 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorizations in this section shall be used for training costs, exclusive of training allowances, of projects under title II of this Act.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment would limit the funds which could be spent for training costs of the projects under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act. The amendment would place the limitation at 30 percent of the funds appropriated.

The Department, up to the present time, has been operating at this percentage, or relatively close to it. Considering the large authorization which was passed by the Senate on Wednesday, September 4, of this year, the amendment would insure that training costs would

not increase merely because there was more money to be spent.

I have a list of obligations by activity, which shows that with respect to the \$140 million appropriated by the House for this program the training cost allowance is about 33 percent. I would reduce the percentage to 30, because it seems to me that perhaps administrative expenses and other costs, while the program was getting underway, were somewhat higher than is necessary now.

I think the money should be made available to the trainees, rather than be used to build up a huge administrative staff which is perhaps not necessary.

I point out that this would not be a limitation of dollars, but would be a limitation of a percentage of the appropriations made.

I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I regret that I must oppose the amendment. The amendment would to some extent put into a legislative straitjacket what ought to be the administrative discretion of the people who operate the program.

The Senator from Vermont has figures which appear to satisfy him that the administrative costs have been running about 33 percent. The figures the staff has made available to me indicate that these costs have been running as high as 40 percent. The Senator proposes to limit those costs to 30 percent.

I point out that it is a misnomer to call these costs administrative costs. We are paying some 40 percent of the money available to the local school districts to create and staff the courses necessary to do the retraining. This purpose of the program is not merely to pay training allowances to the people who are unemployed. In my opinion, that should be incidental. The purpose of the program is to finance, at the local school district level and through on-the-job training, an educational process for these people. To me it would be a grave mistake to put into the act definite cost percentages divided between training allowances and the necessary expenses for teachers' salaries, for the rent of classrooms, and for the buying of textbooks and tools with which training can be given. That is the purpose of the program.

I hope the Senate will not put the administrators into a legislative straitjacket. So far as the record shows, the administrators are doing a first-class job under the terms of the law, during the first year.

The committee will take a careful look at the program, as it has in the past. There will be a report from the Secretary month by month and year by year as to how the costs are divided.

I hope the Senate will exercise a bit of restraint as to writing legislative requirements into the act, and accordingly I ask for the defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have seen the figures prepared by the staff or by someone downtown—I am not sure

where they originate—which tend to justify the Senator's point of view. I have tried without success to determine how those figures were arrived at.

I have figures issued by the Department which indicate the obligations by activity. The estimate for 1964 shows that the training costs will amount to 33 percent. With respect to the appropriation of \$140 million passed by the House a short time ago, the estimate indicates that the same figure will be applicable. The revised estimate for 1963 indicates that the costs for training will be 26 percent.

When we consider the \$110 million appropriation approved by the Senate, we find that the training costs were 66 percent of the actual allowance payments. That seems rather high. I believe that the figure of 30 percent is adequate. If I can be persuaded later that it is not, I shall be the first to suggest a higher figure.

In view of the facts I have, which I think have not been rebutted to any successful degree, the figure of 30 percent is accurate, realistic, and one which we should require.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand the Senator's position to be that up to now the Department has actually been operating within a 30-percent limitation?

Mr. PROUTY. About 33 percent.

Mr. MILLER. About 33 percent. So it would appear that the Senator's amendment would not curtail or impede the operations of the Department?

Mr. PROUTY. It is not intended to. I am sure it would not.

Mr. MILLER. Why should the Department need to have more flexibility, to go over 30 percent? The Department should be trying to cut down, rather than to increase, the costs.

Mr. PROUTY. As the program expands, they will find it quite possible, if they so desire, to reduce the administrative figure. That includes administration as well as equipment, instruction, and things of that nature. The 30 percent figure is a generous, fair and realistic one. I hope the Senate will see fit to go along with my proposal.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his response. I am inclined to support the amendment, and there should be a yeas-and-nays vote on it, so I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], on page 3, line 17. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this

vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CARLSON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business and his pair has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 152 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Aiken	Dominick	Miller
Allott	Goldwater	Pearson
Beall	Hruska	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Carlson	Lausche	Thurmond
Curtis	McClellan	Williams, Del.

NAYS—49

Bartlett	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Nelson
Brewster	Holland	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Pell
Cannon	Javits	Proxmire
Case	Johnston	Randolph
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Clark	Keating	Robertson
Cooper	Kennedy	Russell
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Edmondson	Mansfield	Talmadge
Ellender	McCarthy	Walters
Ervin	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Metcalfe	Young, Ohio
Gore	Monroney	
Hart	Moss	

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson	Hartke	Morton
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Humphrey	Neuberger
Boggs	Jackson	Saltonstall
Burdick	Kuchel	Scott
Cotton	Long, La.	Simpson
Dirksen	McGovern	Sparkman
Dodd	McIntyre	Symington
Engle	McNamara	Tower
Fulbright	Mecham	Yarborough
Gruening	Morse	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was rejected.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE BUNDESTAG OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF WEST GERMANY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to inform the Senate that we have as our guests on the floor of the Senate five members of the German Bundestag. They are Mr. Martin Heix, trade union secretary, Christian Democratic Union; Mr. Carl Reinhard, farmer, graduate of Agricultural University, Christian Democratic Union; Mr. Otto Striebeck, journalist, Social Democratic Party of Germany; Dr. Uwe-Jense Nissen, plant medical officer, Social Democratic Party of Germany; and Mr. Ludwig Hamm, lawyer, Free Democratic Party.

We are delighted to have them with us. I hope Senators will take this opportunity to extend their greetings and best wishes to our honored guests.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the entire membership of the Senate, the Chair extends a hearty welcome to the distinguished visitors.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Man-



power Development and Training Act of 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 12, strike out "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof the word "subsections."

After line 17 on page 3, add the following new subsections:

(f) Not more than 20 per centum of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out title II of this Act shall be used for the training of and for training allowances paid to youths over 16 but under 22 years of age.

(g) Not more than 15 per centum of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out title II of this Act shall be used for the purposes of subsection (h) of section 202 thereof.

On page 2, line 8, beginning with "by" strike out all down to and including the comma on line 9 of page 2.

Section 203(c) of Public Law 87-415, is amended by striking out the words "but not more than 5 per centum of the estimated total training allowances paid annually under this section may be paid to such youths."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment has two essential provisions. Each is discussed separately below.

First. The new subsection (f) provides that not more than 20 percent of all the funds authorized for the training projects under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act can be used for the training of youths aged 16 to 22 years. Under present law there is a limitation of 5 percent of "training allowances" of \$20 per week for such youths. S. 1831 increases this percentage to 15 percent. Spokesmen for the Department have indicated a desire to gear this limitation to amounts authorized for the program, rather than to training allowances as the law presently requires. This seems a sensible change to be made in the law because of the disparity between training allowances for youths, \$20, and allowances for adults, \$35. This 20-percent limitation seems to conform with the relationship between adults and youths who need training.

Second. The new subsection (g) places a 15-percent limitation on the amounts of appropriated funds which can be used for the new literacy program, as con-

tained in S. 1831. Testimony has indicated that there are roughly 300,000 "functional illiterates" who need this new program, whereas there are over 600,000 youths who need training. This completely new literacy program would be able to serve its purpose very well under this limitation, and the limitation would assure that the youths and the adults for whom the program was originally designed, would not be deprived of funds necessary for their programs already underway.

The amendment has been offered after discussions with members of the Department. They have not seen this particular amendment, but I believe they approve of it in principle.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I hope the amendment will be defeated. It is another attempt like the one which was defeated a few minutes ago, to apply legislative restrictions which would unduly hamper the Administrator in his conduct of the program.

No effective basis was laid in the hearings of the subcommittee by administration witnesses which would enable us to apply a definite percentage figure to this broad program. To do so at this time, without full consideration, would be an unwise step to take. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Later, in another amendment which I shall offer, in which there is a 20-percent restriction, I shall show that under this proposal at least 100,000 youths could be trained; and that 42,000 could be trained for fiscal 1964, with a 15-percent restriction on the literacy program. So we are not hampering the program in any way.

Under this amendment, not a single nickel need be spent for literacy or youth or adult training. It could be used for any of the three programs.

We are now adding \$200 million to the authorization of \$322 million which was approved last Wednesday. That money will go into the same pot. It could be used for whatever purpose the administrator decided was desirable and necessary. This is not a restrictive amendment; it merely places a ceiling on the amount that can be expended for the literacy program and the youth program. It seems to me it is a valid and reasonable proposal.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have another amendment to offer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall have to ask the Senator to charge the time for the quorum call to the time of the opponents.

Mr. KEATING. That is satisfactory. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 17, it is proposed to add the following new subsection:

(i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act not more than 25 per centum of the funds authorized for the training of youths between the ages of sixteen and twenty-two years shall be used for the training of high school graduates.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment limits the amount of funds to be authorized for the training of youths who are high school graduates. The amendment limits to 25 percent of all funds available for youths the amounts for high school graduates. The Department of Labor and others have indicated concern that too large a percentage of funds for youths were being used for high school graduates, thus reducing too sharply the funds available to train those disadvantaged by the lack of a high school diploma.

In his testimony before the subcommittee, Secretary of Labor Wirtz said—and I think it is quite significant:

Two-thirds of all the unemployed people in this country today did not finish high school. But two-thirds of the trainees under this year's administration of the Manpower Development and Training Act—over two-thirds—did finish high school.

Now, what that means is that because of the circumstances of the situation under the present law, we ought to be beaming this program more at those who did not have the advantage of a high school education, but as things worked out, it is beamed much more toward those who did have the advantage of a high school education.

Mr. President, the comments of the Secretary of Labor indicate that as the act has been administered up until now, the persons who need the program the least are the ones who are receiving the benefits. The average boy or girl who graduates from high school has an opportunity, through various programs, to fit himself for a productive adult life. But the training program was primarily intended to help persons who did not have educational advantages, who are high school dropouts, or who are illiterates.

I believe that some restriction of this nature is highly necessary and desirable at this time. A great many high school graduates would still be eligible under the proposal I am offering now.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The amendment is another effort to write unnecessary legislative restrictions into an act under which greater flexibility should be left to the administrator. We have a situation in which perhaps a majority of young persons between the ages of 18 and 22 who would want to train under this act are high school graduates. We do not have yet

a sufficient statistical basis to determine what that percentage would be. But to write a 25-percent limitation into the act would make it more difficult to administer the act successfully. It would not reduce the cost. It could do no good, and it might conceivably do a perceptible amount of harm. Accordingly, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reiterate what the Secretary of Labor said; that is, that the program as it has been administered up to now is primarily of value to high school graduates; it does not reach down to high school dropouts and illiterates, for whom the program was originally designed and promoted.

The restriction I propose is not at all unrealistic. It is worthwhile, and would enable the administrator to perform far better work and for the benefit of persons who most need the assistance.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with "In" on line 13, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the period on line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I said on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, the Senate should consider all programs related to the one being considered today; that is, programs involving vocational and educational programs of one kind or another.

I should like to read into the Record—and I feel certain I have missed some items—the amount of money which has been either appropriated or authorized or for which requests for authorization have been made in the field of education, manpower retraining, and development.

The Senate has already appropriated \$110 million for the manpower development and training program for fiscal 1964. The bill before the Senate, S. 1831, authorizes \$100 million for fiscal 1964.

S. 1761, which the Senate passed on Wednesday of this week, authorizes \$322 million for fiscal 1965.

S. 1831, the bill the Senate is now considering, authorizes \$100 million for fiscal 1965.

That is a total of \$632 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act for fiscal 1964 and fiscal 1965.

In addition to this amount, \$100 million has been appropriated by the Senate for the Youth Employment Act. The vocational education bill, which is before the Senate at the present time, will ap-

propriate for this year \$108 million, and for fiscal 1965, \$153 million.

Under the Area Redevelopment Act, there is a program involving \$4,500,000 for retraining and vocational education.

There is also an additional appropriation or authorization for \$15 million for the vocational education; another authorization of \$50 million for vocational education.

These items total \$1,072,500,000 for the next 2 fiscal years.

Perhaps I should say that I have added \$30 million to that figure, to conform with the House appropriations for the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that in the next 2 years the Government will be spending \$1,072 million under what is known as the Manpower Development and Training Act?

Mr. PROUTY. No; it is \$632 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act. I say it will be spent; that is not completely accurate. That will depend on the amount appropriated. These are amounts which have been authorized or for which authorization is now being sought.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will be \$632 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In addition, \$440 million could potentially be spent under other authorizations?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So the total amount, from all sources, for retraining would be \$1,072 million in the next 2 years?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I think this is a good amendment, and I intend to vote for it—although like other amendments already offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I assume it will be defeated.

I understand that a yeas-and-nays vote has been ordered on the question of agreeing to this amendment, but not on the question of the passage of the bill. Therefore, at this time I wish to go on record as being opposed to passage of the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I do not wish to impose on the time of Senators who already have general knowledge of the outcome of the vote on this amendment.

The information I have, based on this \$632 million figure, is that during the fiscal year 1964, 204,000 individuals can come under 1 of the 3 programs envisaged by the Manpower Development and Training Act as the bill proposes to amend it and during the fiscal year 1965, 385,000 will be eligible. That total can be broken down in different ways, but that is the maximum number of those who can be included under the program and under the funds which have been either appropriated or authorized, or for which authorization is sought.

It seems to me it is humanly impossible for the Department to administer a pro-

gram of this magnitude, inasmuch as it is just barely getting off the ground at the present time. If double the money could be profitably used for this manpower development and training program, I would be willing and happy to vote for it; but all this money is unnecessary. We authorized \$322 million last Wednesday. Two days later we are asked to authorize an additional \$200 million, which would make a total of \$522 million.

None of that money needs to be spent for an illiteracy program. None of it needs to be spent for a youth program. None of it needs to be spent for an adult program. There is no need to spend it for all or for one or two of these programs. So what is proposed today is simply that we add a \$200 million authorization to the \$322 million authorization we approved last Wednesday. I believe there is no justification for doing this.

I believe my record shows that I am and have been a friend of legislation of this type. I believe we are faced with very serious problems affecting our young people, and our unemployed; and I want to do everything humanly possible to help them. But simply to authorize and, later, to appropriate money is not enough. The program must be administered in an effective way. I believe Senators have approached this problem on the basis of faith, hope, and charity. All these are admirable virtues; but we must apply a little analytical judgment, as well.

I am not opposed to the program, but I object very strenuously to authorizing or appropriating about twice as much money as can possibly be spent.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say. I favor the program; but I am opposed to throwing money away or appropriating more than can possibly be used in an effective manner. In my opinion, the issue before us is as simple as that.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of the time under my control.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if this amendment is agreed to, the number of individuals who can be trained under this program and under the new program provided for in Senate bill 1831 will be cut from 100,000 to 60,000. In other words, if the amendment is adopted, 40,000 of those who now have no employable skills will continue to be unemployed.

The cost of the program is running about \$1,000 a trainee. The Senator from Vermont proposes to cut \$40 million from the program. Relatively few Americans are functional illiterates; most Americans can do elementary mathematics in their heads. So it is clear that if the authorization is reduced from \$100,000,000 to \$60,000,000, 40,000 people will be deprived of the benefits of the program. The issue before us is that simple.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated.



I yield back the remainder of my time.  
Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it should be pointed out that last Wednesday we added \$161 million to the program authorization, thus increasing it to \$322 million. Now it is proposed that we add \$200 million to all that. Certainly the two should have been combined, so that at that time Senators could have known the total which would confront them.

The pending amendment would strike out of the proposed authorization \$140 million which is absolutely unnecessary.

The remaining \$60 million authorization would be somewhat larger than I think necessary; but I am willing to have that amount authorized, in order to make my amendment more palatable to Senators who otherwise might oppose it.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have voted "nay." I have a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator

from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CARLSON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business and his pair has been previously announced. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 153 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Alken	Goldwater	Pearson
Allott	Hill	Prouty
Beall	Holland	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Russell
Carlson	Johnston	Smith
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Dominick	Lausche	Thurmond
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Miller	

NAYS—38

Bartlett	Hayden	Moss
Bibie	Humphrey	Muskie
Brewster	Inouye	Nelson
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Pastore
Cannon	Keating	Pell
Case	Kennedy	Proxmire
Church	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Clark	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Edmondson	McCarthy	Smathers
Ervin	McGee	Walters
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morse	

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson	Gruening	Morton
Bayh	Hartke	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Boggs	Jackson	Saltonstall
Burdick	Kuchel	Scott
Cotton	Long, La.	Simpson
Dirksen	Mansfield	Sparkman
Dodd	McGovern	Symington
Douglas	McIntyre	Tower
Engle	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Mechem	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the word "and."

On page 2, line 22, it is proposed to strike all after the word "failed" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and that such failure to attend school classes was due to the economic circumstances of the family or household of which the individual was a member, which required the individual to seek employment or training for employment."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amendment is designed to spike the objection to the bill that the bill would be calculated in its results to encourage dropouts of our youngsters from school. The amendment would not be necessary were it not for the fact that the bill would lower the age for eligibility.

Inasmuch as the age limit is to be lowered, I think all of us should make it very clear that it is our intention to encourage people to stay in school, and that we do not wish to do anything to encourage people to drop out of school.

The bill will have a tendency in that direction, as a result of the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to change the period of time involved from 3 months to 6 months, so that no one could become eligible unless he had been out of school for more than 6 months.

I am not sure that all of this will be necessary, because we can readily understand how a student might decide to drop out for 6 months and sit it out to become eligible for 52 weeks of training allowances. We would not want that to happen.

The bill provides that notwithstanding the 6 months of absence from classes all appropriate procedures, including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities, must be gone through, but I suggest that all of these appropriate procedures of guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities will be an exercise in futility if the individual concerned has already made up his mind that what he is going to do is sit it out for 6 months and then become eligible for 52 weeks of the training allowances.

The amendment proposes to add a further criterion. That criterion would be that the failure to attend the class for 6 months was due to economic circumstances of the family or household of which the individual is a member, which

economic circumstances required the individual to seek employment or to seek training for employment.

This is directly in line with what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] earlier stated when I asked him about the problem of school dropouts. The Senator raised the point, which was a valid point, that a student might be required to drop out of school in order to help earn bread for the family. This is a valid point. The student might drop out of school because it was necessary for him to obtain training for employment to help in the economic situation of the family. If an individual came from a broken home and was in a household, it might be necessary for him to help earn some bread for the household.

The amendment would do nothing more than gear the bill with that point made by the Senator from Pennsylvania in mind. It would provide another safeguard calculated to prevent the bill from encouraging dropouts, one of our greatest tragedies.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Iowa in this amendment. I think the Senator has explained it thoroughly. I wish to make only a few comments.

I agree wholeheartedly with the purpose of this amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act, because the purpose is to include young people between the ages of 16 and 19 among those who can be trained. Not only would they be included for basic skills, but also they would be included for functional literacy training, to give them at least the simplest fundamentals of reading, writing, and arithmetic skills to enable them to take basic training in school.

When we read that 500,000 or 600,000 young people were unemployed in the past year, we realize that the situation is sad. It is an indictment of our educational system throughout this country, that it does not provide to thousands and thousands of young people functional literacy, or even the basic requirements for earning a living for themselves and for their families.

It has been developed in the debate that the program should not induce young people to leave school when they are able to stay in school. The amendment which has been agreed to, to provide that there must be a failure to attend a school for 6 months will act against such an objective.

As the Senator from Iowa has explained, our amendment would provide another safeguard against dropouts. It would make money available to those boys and girls who need it most.

It is evident that the authorization in the bill, to be followed by appropriations, will not provide sufficient funds to train all the young people between 16 and 19 years of age who need training in basic skills or who need training in fundamental literacy requirements. The amendment, if adopted, would make whatever amounts of money are appropriated available to young men and women whose families are not able to

keep them in school, and it would make this money available to them when the circumstances of the family made it necessary for boys and girls over 16 years of age to leave school to work or to be trained in order to go to work.

The provision we have offered touches a problem which has not been debated. The effect would be to provide the money which is made available to those boys and girls whose families are not able to keep them in school, when the circumstances demand that they work to help support the family as well as to support themselves.

If a family has funds to keep children in school, it is the duty of the family to use every bit of persuasion and effort it can to keep a boy or girl in school. If a family needs funds for its own sustenance, the boy or girl would have to go to work—and many of them do—to help provide for the family needs.

The effect of the amendment would be to direct whatever funds are appropriated to boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 19 whose families are not able to keep them in school and whose families need their help. I submit, upon that ground, that it is an amendment which should be adopted. If the money is not directed to those who need it, who by reason of the circumstances of their families have not been able to secure the schooling necessary to train them, I do not know to whom it should be directed.

That would be the effect of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the amendment offered by our two capable colleagues, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], in my opinion provides for new procedures which would add a further layer of bureaucracy to the administration of the present training program.

I ask for the attention of the sponsors of the amendment, because I should like to stress the point that the amendment overlooks the fact that those who drop out, at the ages of 16 through 18, have in many instances left school for other than what might be clearly characterized as economic reasons.

I point to the language which I think, frankly, is ill defined: "Economic circumstances of the family or household."

I warn Senators that this could well mean that the Secretary of Labor, through representatives of that Department, would investigate bank accounts. This is possible, and I think is a practical possibility. The debts of the parent or parents of the household could be gone into, because if the economic circumstances are to be determined, an investigation must be made. Very frankly, one would have to investigate family by family, and household by household, to ascertain whether the youngster dropped out of school for any reason which could be described as an economic circumstance.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I can understand the Senator's concern about this question; but would not that investigation have already been made by the local authorities? It seems to me almost inconceivable that a family in circumstances justifying the dropout would not have been on the local relief rolls, which would have already required an investigation. So the Senator's concern, while recognizable, is perhaps a little unfounded, because the investigation would already have been made. I find it inconceivable to suppose that the Secretary would not go to the local authorities for this information.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The investigation required by the amendment as offered is in no sense required by the bill as reported. The factual determination presently contemplated by the bill does not go to the point of the economic circumstances of the family.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Senator from West Virginia if the financial circumstances of the family are not the very ones which cause the local authorities to provide for A, B, or C, or for other types of assistance, to the family?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will read the language of the bill. I think it is important to check it, because, as I have indicated, it provides:

That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under 19 years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than 3 months—

It was amended to 6 months—

during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.

The bill does not refer to the economic circumstances of the youngster's family.

Mr. MILLER. Not so far as the Senator has read; but my point is, if the Senator will read further, and add our amendment to what he has read, that it involves the economic circumstances, which is the point of his argument—

Mr. RANDOLPH. I interrupt the Senator to say that that is what I am opposed to, and that is what the committee is opposed to. The Senator has said that this investigation already has been concluded.

Mr. MILLER. I am suggesting to the Senator from West Virginia that his fear of a great mass of administrative detail that is going to have to be gone into by the Secretary in order to meet the requirement provided by our amendment is probably overstated. I believe that in a great many cases the determination of the economic circumstances of a family would already have been gone into by the local authorities, and all the Secretary's field agents would have to do would be to contact the local agents and ascertain whether or not a family was in a bad economic situation. I do not think it would require too much of an investigation.



Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Before I yield, let me say that I disagree with the Senator from Iowa. I understand his position, but it would be a different type of investigation, and that is why we are against it. We think that type of investigation is not a practical one.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I must say that the Senator from West Virginia overemphasizes the kind of investigation which would have to be conducted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes yielded to the Senator have expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

Mr. COOPER. The language which was reported by the committee states, "the Secretary shall have satisfied himself." So that language would apply also to the amendment which we have offered, namely, that the Secretary shall have satisfied himself about the conditions provided. He would have to satisfy himself that the individual had failed to attend school classes for a period of 6 months, and that all kinds of procedures had been used to induce or encourage him to stay in school.

What we have offered is much more simple. The Secretary would merely determine from local information whether a boy or girl came from a family whose financial circumstances were such that they had no funds and that this training was needed to help him or her secure functional literacy or training for a job.

The fact that such boys and girls do not have these basic skills, or that they have not been able to secure the most fundamental educational requirements for finding jobs, would indicate in most cases that they came from families which, for various reasons, were not able to keep them in school or help them continue their education.

There is not enough money to train every boy and girl who is not employed. Certainly not enough money is provided in this bill for that purpose. I make the point that, on the basis of the money available, if we are to train persons for employment and if we are to try to give them some qualifications, this money certainly ought to go to individuals from families who themselves are unable to provide educational and training opportunities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. COOPER. I yield myself 1 minute.

If these individuals come from families who have the money to keep them in school or provide for their training, why should they not do it? Why should the Government do it? This amendment directs the aid to the boy or girl coming from the type of family with which the Senator from West Virginia and I are familiar, a family which cannot provide such opportunity.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I conclude by saying that I understand the concern of the sponsors of the amendment. I repeat to them that in reality they would adopt the concept of the pauper's oath and would apply it to the youth training program proposed by the bill. That is absolutely what would have to be done, because Senators are asking, in effect, for a profit-and-loss sheet within a family or household. There are many reasons why a boy will drop from school. They can and often do involve a complication of causes other than economic circumstances. These young men and women should nonetheless remain eligible for the training program, including the allowances.

The thought expressed by the Senator from Kentucky is understandable, but I cannot agree with the conclusion.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senators offering the amendment will do so.

Mr. MILLER. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I withhold the request to yield back my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am really sorry the Senator from West Virginia has thrown out the old bugaboo about the pauper's oath. There is nothing further from the minds of the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Iowa than a pauper's oath procedure. However, if the Secretary saw fit to require a pauper's oath, which I do not think he would, he would be entitled to do so under the authority of the bill. But I find it difficult to believe that the Secretary would do so. I do not think it is the intent of any Senator to require a pauper's oath in order to meet the test of whether or not the economic circumstances of the family or household from which one of the dropouts came were such as to require him to drop out of school to seek employment or training for employment.

I suggest further that the local authorities would be pretty well able to advise the field agent or the secretary whether a family was in bad economic straits, so that the Secretary could be satisfied on this limitation.

The amendment is not a difficult one to enforce. It is pretty broad when we say that the Secretary must be satisfied on this point. The degree of satisfaction does not have to be one entailing minute examination of a balance sheet. I believe the local authorities would be in a pretty good position to lend assistance in this respect. I believe that they would see to it that families which could afford to keep their boy or girl in school would not be the recipients of Federal largesse. I hope the amendment will be adopted. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Senator from West Virginia is entirely correct. If the amendment is adopted we shall have a brand new bureaucracy engaged in investigating the finances of every family that wishes to

take advantage of the training program under the bill. It will involve a balance sheet and a profit and loss statement, and the equivalent of a Dun & Bradstreet investigation. In the end we shall practically require a young man to take a pauper's oath.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I will take only 1 minute. This matter is not necessarily related to economic circumstances. What is the purpose of the training? It is not merely related to poverty. The purpose is to equip people to make a useful contribution to production. Many school dropouts are totally unacquainted with the industrial processes, the manufacturing processes, or the trade processes of the American economy. The purpose of the program is not merely related to poverty but, rather, to the upgrading of the skills of American workers. It would be a very foolish thing to subject them to this kind of limitation. I am sure the matter of economic circumstances will be a factor, and it should be, but it should not be the only factor. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Let us suppose that there is only so much money to go around. Would it not be better to see to it that the money went to the families which have an economic need for this program? We do not have enough money for everyone. As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, the objective of the amendment is to see to it that the money goes to households which need this assistance. If we had all the money in the world and did not have to worry about these things, that would be one thing. However, we are limited with respect to the amount of money that can be used. I suggest that that is the reason for narrowing down the coverage to those who need the assistance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am confident that the question of economic need is a factor, and that it will be taken into consideration by the local authorities. I do not believe that the Secretary of Labor should make that judgment. I would prefer to provide a broader jurisdiction, or give more leeway at the local level, than to have this restrictive language added. I do not deny that the economic factor is important and should be taken into consideration.

Mr. MILLER. But there is nothing in the bill that deals with it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The debate says something about it, and the original act contains something about it. Everyone knows that something ought to be done about it.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I

have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CARLSON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are detained on official

business and their respective pairs have been previously announced. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 49, as follows:

#### [No. 154 Leg.]

##### YEAS—17

Aiken	Dominick	Prouty
Allott	Hruska	Russell
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Carlson	Keating	Smith
Cooper	Miller	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Pearson	

##### NAYS—49

Bartlett	Hill	Muskie
Beall	Holland	Nelson
Bible	Inouye	Pastore
Brewster	Javits	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Case	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Church	Lausche	Robertson
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Edmondson	McCarthy	Talmadge
Ellender	McClellan	Thurmond
Ervin	McGee	Walters
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morse	
Hayden	Moss	

##### NOT VOTING—34

Anderson	Gruening	Morton
Bayh	Hartke	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Boggs	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Burdick	Jackson	Simpson
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Long, La.	Symington
Dodd	Mansfield	Tower
Douglas	McGovern	Yarborough
Engle	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	McNamara	
Goldwater	Mechem	

So the amendment of Mr. MILLER and Mr. COOPER was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for a nongermane statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it will be a very germane statement. I ask unanimous consent that at the final printing of the bill, following what I hope will be its passage, the name of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] be included as a cosponsor. Inadvertently, his name was omitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio desired to have a few

minutes yielded to him. I will yield time to him. Does the Senator desire 5 minutes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Not more; perhaps less.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as this session of Congress moved forward, I had hoped that it would finally be possible for me, because of thrift, to be able to vote for a tax cut. It is obvious that there is no reason to reduce expenditures for the purpose of neutralizing the losses that will come from the passage of a tax cut bill. Old subsidies are being increased, and new ones are being established. New functions are being created by the Federal Government, usurping a field that historically and traditionally has been occupied by the State governments.

Government has entered into functions which never before have been performed by government, but always by private enterprise—functions such as area redevelopment, domestic peace corps, extravagant urban redevelopment, mass transportation at a cost of not less than \$6 billion but probably closer to \$10 billion, new subsidies for the building of fishing vessels, and supplemental public works, duplicating what we had in the 1930's. Also, on-the-job training for adults and on-the-job training for juveniles.

The program now proposed would have these young people told, "Drop out of school and forget your studies, and we will pay you and train you after you have done that."

Mr. President, 35 percent of the national income is now being spent for the maintenance of Federal, State, and local government. Since 1961, the national debt has been increased from \$286 to \$305 billion. Increasingly there is being vested in the Federal Government power which makes it possible for those in authority to bend the backs and twist the thinking of American businessmen and frequently induce immorality among those doing business—all because of the power of the omnipotent Central Government. Every day the power of the Federal Government is—by means of the action of Congress—being expanded.

On the basis of the evidence of what is happening, I cannot vote for this bill or any other bill which disregards the necessity of fiscal responsibility. More and more I am becoming convinced that the old adage or principle, "Do the essential things, and provide by taxes the funds to finance them," has been abandoned. In the 1930's there was substituted the philosophy "Spend and spend, and tax and tax." Then came the new era of "Spend and spend, but do not tax. Let our descendants, the children of the future, pay the bill; meanwhile, we will sing and dance." Mr. President, I cannot subscribe to that philosophy.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, S. 1831 is the second amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to be considered by the Senate in this session. This bill would provide for the Department of Labor to refer eligible



workers to programs that will provide the training in basic literacy and work skills necessary to prepare these people to qualify for the direct occupational training now available under the act. It would also lower the minimum age qualification from 19 to 16, provided any such eligible person has been out of school for more than 3 months, and would increase the percentage of total allowances provided under the act that would be paid to such youths from 5 to 15 percent.

This bill is an important supplement to the President's recommendations on civil rights insofar as they affect the Manpower Act. It will enable us to reach in some measure, the more than 700,000 unemployed youths between the ages of 16 and 21, many of whom are dropouts. For example, in my own State of Rhode Island, where 7.7 percent of our eligible workers are unemployed, approximately 20 percent of our children drop out of school before they complete their 4 years. And in Providence the dropout rate shoots up to approximately 36 percent. While our unemployment rate nationally is nearly 5½ percent and it skyrockets to over 16 percent for those under 20. Coupled with these is the fact that one out of four of these unemployed youths are nonwhite.

We who represent this Nation in Congress must cope with this problem, for it is one of national proportions. We must in every manner possible enact significant legislation to meet this crisis, for growing unemployment means an ever-increasing burden on society. Those critics who decry the so-called welfare state would be well advised to support every effort to train our unemployed citizens in those skills necessary to enable them to gain and hold jobs. This bill before us is only a small step in that direction, but it is a forward step and one which we should not and cannot make with hesitation.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the debate today on the Manpower Development and Training Act, I believe we should not overlook the fact that Federal aid is not the only solution to solving our unemployment problems. A key to creating jobs is local initiative. Under-scoring this is an article which appears in the September 1963 issue of *Nation's Business*. The article cites the work of South Carolina's Committee for Technical Education which, it notes, operates independently of other State agencies, including the federally aided department of education. This committee is unusual in that it is financed entirely by State and local money and makes no demands whatsoever on the use of Federal funds.

To say the least, this do-it-yourself approach is refreshingly needed and it shows what States and local communities can do if they take the initiative.

In this connection, the Fort Dodge, Iowa, Messenger, on January 24 of this year, published an article in which a New York Herald Tribune news service reporter, Harold I. Rogers, took a hard look at a survey conducted by the Connecticut office of the Federal Employment Serv-

ice. I would like to quote from this article:

The authorities selected 3,500 semiskilled workers as candidates for retraining, and actually interviewed 2,143 of them. That is, they looked up these workers and tried to get them to retrain themselves.

From this number, 589 were selected to take machinist aptitude tests. When the day of the test rolled around, only 388 showed up. Only 140 passed it.

Mr. President, I feel this is a sad commentary on Federal efforts to reduce unemployment.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles, entitled "Here's Do-It-Yourself Unemployment Cure" from *Nation's Business* and "Retraining: Does It Help Unemployment?" from the Fort Dodge Messenger, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *Nation's Business*, September 1963]  
HERE'S DO-IT-YOURSELF UNEMPLOYMENT CURE

Curtis Pettit worked for 20 years as an oiler in a South Carolina textile mill, bringing home a paycheck which rarely exceeded \$50 a week.

But one payday recently Mr. Pettit received a check of more than \$100 for the first time in his life. He is now a skilled machinist in the Firestone Steel Products Co., at Spartanburg, S.C.

Who brought about the change? Mr. Pettit did—by seizing an opportunity offered to him by the South Carolina Committee for Technical Education. After investing 520 hours of his time in evening training classes, he qualified last April for the job at Firestone.

Now his foreman says: "When I want a top-quality job done, I give it to Curtis Pettit."

The committee for technical education has trained Mr. Pettit and 10,000 more of South Carolina's unemployed and underemployed workers since its establishment 2 years ago by the State legislature. Workers are now being trained at the rate of 800 each month, and program officials expect to be training 17,000 workers a year by mid-1966.

The problem of teaching workers the skills which will fit them for available jobs is of national importance. Although our country's expanding economy has provided about 870,000 jobs during the past year, they had to be divided among more than 1 million new workers.

For the past 5 years unemployment has surpassed 5 percent of the work force. As the mass of young workers enters the job market in the next several years, the gap between added workers and available jobs will widen.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that our rapidly developing technology has made some jobs obsolete, although it has created others.

The Kennedy administration wants to meet the unemployment problem through tax reduction, public works acceleration, and youth employment proposals.

Many States are taking action to meet the dilemma. A number of them are making use of money provided under the Manpower Development and Training Act, passed last year by Congress and for which the administration is seeking additional funds.

South Carolina's Committee for Technical Education—which operates independently of other State agencies, including the federally aided department of education—is an example of the imaginative approach of some States.

It is unusual in an important respect—it is financed entirely by State and local money, making no use of Federal aid.

This do-it-yourself philosophy, and the effectiveness with which it is getting the job done, has won the respect of business leaders throughout the State. Robert N. Mitchell, a vice president of the SCM Corp.'s Marchant Division and general manager of its calculator-manufacturing plant at Orangeburg, S.C., says:

"The committee's program has been a major contributing factor to our success. It was vital in helping us start up this plant and reach full efficiency in a short time. Without it, we would have been faced with a monumental task in getting a trained work force."

The purpose of TEC, as the committee is called, is stated concisely by South Carolina's Gov. Donald S. Russell:

"This program takes people who want a job and trains them to get it. We have many of these people in our State."

"South Carolina has been too long a single-industry State. TEC has helped us diversify our industrial base, which is necessary to develop our economy and create more jobs for our people."

The do-it-yourself approach runs throughout the program. J. Bonner Manly, one of the committee's eight members and an official of Abbeville Mills, describes it this way:

"At the State level, we are using the State's own money to help its people train for new jobs."

"At the local level, communities have raised about \$5 million to build the technical education centers which form a major part of the program."

"But the key ingredient lies with the individuals who invest their own time and effort to upgrade skills and learn new skills so that they will qualify for better jobs. Our prime asset is their motivation to make their own investment in the program in order to benefit from it."

As in the case of other Southern States, in financial resources and per capita income. Yet we have a training program which is both productive and economical. Everyone contributes—there is nothing here for the person looking for a handout."

As in the case of other Southern States, South Carolina faces a double threat to employment. Mechanization of farming and Federal crop restrictions, together with growing foreign competition in cotton and tobacco, are forcing the farm population down at the rate of 12,000 persons each year. At the same time, automation in the textile industry, which historically has provided two-thirds of the State's industrial employment, is eliminating 6,000 jobs yearly.

"To find new jobs for all these people, plus the youths entering the work force, we have to run fast just to stand still," says A. Wade Martin, State coordinator of the committee. "We must industrialize to provide these jobs."

South Carolina officials believe that TEC is making a significant impact on the State's unemployment problem in two ways:

By training workers in industrial skills, it is providing a growing labor pool which makes expansion of existing industry possible and also attracts new industry to the State, thus creating new jobs. And for each new industrial job, two service jobs customarily come into existence in the community. New and expanded industry in the State produced about 12,500 new industrial jobs a year from 1959 through 1961. In 1962, as the committee began to swing into full operation, this figure jumped to 18,500.

By upgrading the skills of employed and underemployed workers—in addition to teaching new skills to the unemployed—the program makes it possible for them to move up the job ladder, leaving room at the bottom for less qualified workers who need jobs.

When a service station attendant, through training, moves into a job as an automobile mechanic, he leaves his former position open for a less skilled individual who has no job.

How does TEC operate? It is governed by a committee of six citizens, who represent different parts of the State and are business leaders intimately acquainted with the job needs of business and industry. These men are appointed by the Governor with the consent of the State senate. Two State officials, the superintendent of education and the director of the State development board, are ex officio members to insure coordination with their agencies. Mr. Martin, a methods engineer and former administrator of industrial and technical education in North Carolina, heads the full-time staff.

#### COUNTIES BUILD CENTERS

Eight technical education centers have been established where labor market surveys have shown a need for them. One—at Greenville—has been in operation for the past year, four will open this month, and three will open early in 1964. Each has a full-time administrative and teaching staff aided by an area commission for technical education, made up of local businessmen.

These centers—which contain classrooms, laboratories, and workshops—are built and owned by the counties which they serve. Building costs range from \$540,000 to \$850,000. Equipment, from machine tools to computers, is owned by the State. This permits shifting items from one center to another as needs dictate. TEC has bought more than \$1 million in up-to-date equipment.

Strong emphasis is placed on keeping abreast of current employment needs and industrial practices. All faculty members must have had experience in industry and will be rotated back to their own industry periodically to familiarize them with the latest techniques.

For each type of training, a committee of men from that particular technical area or craft passes judgment on the teachers, equipment, and instruction. Robert L. Grigsby, director of the Richland Technical Education Center at Columbia, says:

"These committees are the life blood of each program. They keep us completely up to date."

The courses at the technical education centers are separated into three divisions:

The technical division—offering training for jobs at the technician level. Programs include data processing; technical drafting and design; chemical, electronic, or textile technology, and others. A high school education is required for enrollment, and the programs extend for 2 years of full-time instruction or 4 years of evening classes.

The trade division—where a student may learn the skills needed in air conditioning, refrigeration, and heating; automotive mechanics; industrial electricity; machine shop work, and welding.

The extension division—which makes available courses requested by a particular industry. Instruction, including supervisory level courses, is given at the center or at the plant.

#### ALL APPLICANTS TESTED

Students attending evening classes at the Greenville center include such men as E. J. Hall, a 33-year-old tool and die maker who is studying tool and die design. "I want to better my education and move up in my company," he says. "Because of this training, I've been promised the next job in design that opens up in my shop."

Standards are high at the centers. Applicants are given a series of aptitude tests and their school records examined. On the basis of this, they are advised whether they qualify for training as a technician or as a skilled craftsman. A continuing effort is

made to prevent anyone from trying to train for a job which would be beyond his ability.

A major part of TEC's work during the past 2 years has been setting up and operating temporary training courses for corporations which have opened a new plant in South Carolina or expanded their existing plant. Nearly 70 such crash programs have provided trained workers and some are still in operation. About \$315,000 of the committee's \$1.8 million budget for the current fiscal year will be used to finance these operations.

Companies taking advantage of these programs, which have placed many of the State's unemployed and underemployed workers in skilled industrial jobs, praise the quality of their newly trained employees.

The State offers no payments to persons undergoing training—in contrast to the subsistence allowances paid under Federal programs. Officials credit this with screening out people more interested in benefiting from the Government payroll than in preparing themselves for a job.

"The degree of motivation is vital," says O. Stanley Smith, Jr., a Columbia businessman who is chairman of the Committee for Technical Education. "It's a fact of life that if you put your own time and effort into a project, you're motivated to do a better job than if it is handed to you on a silver platter. It's educationally unsound and a waste of money to pay people to learn. Education and relief are not the same and they shouldn't be mixed."

"We've found that the same motivation that moves the individuals in our program also moves our communities. I believe they have worked harder to help themselves by financing TEC centers than they would have if the money had been provided for them. Some current proposals for Federal aid include funds for construction. Imagine the effect of this on communities which already have paid their own way."

#### HOW PROGRAM WORKS

As R. L. Boynton, a training specialist who is conducting a program to provide aircraft assemblers for a Lockheed Aircraft Corp. plant at Charleston, puts it:

"When you have a fellow who will go through a training course on his own time with no pay, you've got a man who really wants to work."

Possibly the most dramatic of the crash programs are those which provide a trained work force for a new plant. A typical example is the program that trained 162 skilled workers for a multimillion-dollar Elgin National Watch Co. plant near Columbia.

Six months before the plant opened last February, specialists from the TEC staff began planning with Elgin officials a training operation which would be completed at the precise time the plant would be ready to go into production. The local community made available a school gymnasium as training quarters, and it was air conditioned and dustproofed to make possible the delicate work of watch assembly. TEC moved in some equipment from its pool, and Elgin provided the specialized equipment required.

Specialists determined the skills which would be needed and the number of workers with each skill. A critical path schedule was set up so that the training courses for different skills, which ranged from 4 to 12 weeks, would be phased in to reach completion at the same time.

Instructors from Elgin were placed temporarily on the committee payroll, and more than 300 applicants for training were interviewed and given aptitude tests. Of these, 196 were selected for training and 162 completed the course. All were hired by Elgin and, when the plant opened, a trained force was ready to go to work at jobs which had been completely unfamiliar 3 months earlier.

"The trainees' willingness and ability to learn was even greater than our expecta-

tions," says Marlen E. Benter, Elgin's chief industrial engineer. "Some of them came out of the program at 100 percent efficiency and, thanks to TEC, the lag between plant opening and full productivity was shortened by more than 4 months. We've exceeded our original production schedules and have moved the schedules up."

The plant, which has been assembling and casing watches, is now preparing to manufacture the parts. A second training program will teach new skills to nearly 300 people.

Members of the Committee for Technical Education are so enthusiastic about the results of their do-it-yourself training program that they journeyed to Washington recently to point out to the South Carolina congressional delegation the shortcomings of proposals to expand existing Federal programs and enact new ones.

Bonner Manly puts the consensus of the committee into these words:

"There are great opportunities ahead for people throughout our Nation, but they will never achieve them without investing their own time and energy."

[From the Fort Dodge Messenger, Jan. 24, 1963]

#### RETRAINING: DOES IT HELP UNEMPLOYMENT? (By Harold I. Rogers)

NEW YORK.—The Connecticut office of the Federal Employment Service has issued some disturbing figures which should—but probably won't—have an adverse effect on efforts to increase appropriations for the much-vaunted Federal job retraining program.

That program, you may recall, has been put into effect in areas where there are high rates of unemployment, in an effort to train workers to have more marketable skills.

Connecticut had one of the first such programs because its industrial areas were among the earliest to be blighted by the 1960-61 recession.

The authorities selected 3,500 semiskilled workers as candidates for retraining, and actually interviewed 2,143 of them. That is, they looked up these works and tried to get them to retrain themselves.

From this number, 589 were selected to take machinist aptitude tests. When the day of the test rolled around, only 388 showed up.

Only 140 passed it.

Of this number, only 84 completed the retraining program which was offered, not only free of charge, but which included also a subsistence allowance for the student and his family.

The record, then: Fewer than 3 out of every 100 of the semiskilled unemployed reached a goal. They either could not or would not become skilled workers. Most of the 84 out of the 3,500 who were selected for training eventually found their new jobs.

About the same record has been established in West Virginia, another State with an early retraining program because it had an early problem of high unemployment.

It's likely that there will be glowing and optimistic reports of the program when officials come before Congress for money to keep it going in 1963. Perhaps these figures will be remembered.

In the 18 months it has been in operation, the depressed-areas program claims to have created a mere 25,000 jobs. That's an average of only 500 per State and it's a mighty insignificant figure when placed beside the national unemployment total of at least 3.5 million.

Perhaps to some, however, this will serve as further evidence of the fact that Federal schemes for reducing unemployment are not working and that nothing really will work except a thriving, prosperous private economy.



Perhaps that will cause them to wonder why the private economy isn't working so well, and then they will realize that it is caught in a tight profit squeeze, largely of the Government's creation.

It should help with plans to reduce the tax rate, systematically and carefully.

And perhaps, somewhere along the way, the lawmakers will realize that part of the trouble accrues from the lopsided power given to labor leaders when they sit with their employers at the bargaining table.

For unless these things are realized in Congress, other Federal programs aren't going to be of much help. They never have. They never will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time remains to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 28 minutes remaining; the opponents have 37 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] desires to have some time.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to state that I intend to vote "yea" on the question of passage of the bill—albeit I shall do so reluctantly. I believe we need a program of this nature, in order to take care of the needs of our young people who do not have sufficient education, and thus enable them to obtain jobs by which they can support themselves. It is most regrettable that today there are many unemployed who, unless they acquire new skills, cannot become self-supporting. So, in the end, such a program will save the taxpayers a great deal of money, if this program proves to be as effective as all of us hope it will be.

But I am concerned about the expenditures the bill would authorize—a much larger amount than I believe can be spent effectively and productively. So I believe this bill is a very poor way to legislate.

Mr. President, in the current fiscal year the Senate has already authorized the appropriation of \$110 million; the House has authorized the appropriation of \$140 million. Perhaps in the end the conference report will authorize a \$125 million appropriation.

Under the provisions of this bill, we would authorize an additional appropriation of \$100 million, which would bring the total authorization for the current fiscal year to approximately \$225 million. I do not believe that much money can possibly be spent effectively. For the next fiscal year we have already authorized—or will have, when this bill is passed—appropriations of \$422 million. I am sure that much money cannot be spent usefully.

I have submitted several amendments which call for reduced authorizations, both in the bill we passed last Wednesday and in this one. I had no expectation that those amendments would be agreed to; but I submitted them primarily in order to establish a record which I hope the members of the Appropria-

tions Committee will examine carefully.

I favor the authorization of any appropriation which can reasonably and soundly be expended and will result in the doing of a good job. But I believe we are being somewhat irresponsible when we authorize the appropriation of funds which we know cannot be spent usefully.

After submitting that explanation, Mr. President, I simply repeat that although I shall vote for passage of the bill, I have serious reservations about the manner in which we have handled it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on the question of passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, all of us respect very deeply the views of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] in regard to the need for tight administration of this program. I certainly agree with him in that respect.

However, I feel that few programs which come before the Senate are more directly related to what is troubling our Nation economically than this one. We have an enormous transition to make, involving tens of millions of Americans, from our present state of technology to a very much higher degree of automation. We face the doubling or the tripling of the requirements for technical training. Our Nation is far behind in this struggle. This deficiency is far more lethal to us than almost any other deficiency we could have; because if we do not blow ourselves up with an atomic bomb, freedom will either win or lose on the basis of the vigor and the vitality of our economic system.

The greatest asset of our Nation lies in the skills of its people. I believe this program, which is long overdue, is directly related to the effectiveness with which we adjust our technology and the skills of our people to modern times.

In addition, millions of our people have not had equal economic opportunity. This program can move in the direction of bringing it to them.

For all those reasons, Mr. President, I strongly favor the bill. Even though I have tried to do what I could to improve it, just as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has done what he could to improve it and to tighten it up, I believe that, fundamentally, the enactment of this bill is very important to our Nation. So I hope very much it will receive a decisive majority vote in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, unless other Senators desire to have time yielded to them, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. CLARK. I do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The bill has been read the third time. The question now is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have

been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CARLSON (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. If he were present and voting, he would "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

If present and voting the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. CARLSON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRksen] is detained on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DOB]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 155 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken	Hart	Moss
Bartlett	Hayden	Muskie
Beall	Humphrey	Nelson
Bible	Inouye	Pastore
Brewster	Javits	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Prouty
Cannon	Kennedy	Proxmire
Case	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Church	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Clark	McCarthy	Scott
Cooper	McGee	Walters
Edmondson	Metcalfe	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gore	Morse	

NAYS—26

Allott	Holland	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Russell
Curtis	Johnston	Smathers
Dominick	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Eastland	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Ellender	Lausche	Talmadge
Ervin	McClellan	Thurmond
Goldwater	Miller	Williams, Del.
Hill	Pearson	

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson	Fulbright	Mechem
Bayh	Gruening	Morton
Bennett	Hartke	Mundt
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Burdick	Jackson	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kuchel	Simpson
Cotton	Long, La.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Mansfield	Symington
Dodd	McGovern	Tower
Douglas	McIntyre	Yarborough
Engle	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (S. 1831) was passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding at the end of section 202 the following new subsection:*

"(h) Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor may also refer for the development of reading, writing and arithmetic and basic work skills those eligible persons who are over thirty-five years of age or who have neither completed the eighth grade of school nor otherwise acquired the educational equivalent of the eighth grade of school and who will thereby be able to pursue courses of occupational training, and such referrals shall be considered a referral for training within the meaning of this Act, except that the provisions of subsection (d) of this section shall not apply to the selection of persons under this subsection, and such persons shall be eligible for an additional 52 weeks of training allowances."

Sec. 2. Subsection (c) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" and inserting the word "sixteen" in lieu thereof, by striking out "5 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 per centum", and by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: "Provided, That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than 6 months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed."

Sec. 3. Section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: "except that with respect to referrals under subsection (h) of section 202 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the training to be provided under such subsection (h) through other appropriate education agencies."

Sec. 4. Section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "vocational" before the words "education and training".

Sec. 5. Subsection (b) of section 305 is amended by striking out the word "vocational".

Sec. 6. Section 304 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title II."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

# TRIBUTES TO SENATORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the second time this week I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Pennsyl-

vania [Mr. CLARK] and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], both of whom have once again shown their skill and knowledge of two vitally important measures which are for the welfare of the people. I only wish that this kind of record could be maintained week in and week out. But I am happy once again to congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia for the great service they have rendered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his kind words. I should like the Record to note the great contribution made by members of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for bringing the bill to the Senate for passage. I express my appreciation also to members of the staff, who worked conscientiously and ably to help prepare the bill and expedite its passage.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also extend my congratulations to other Senators on the majority side, and to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who offered worthwhile amendments, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and other Senators who made contributions to the bill and helped make it a better and stronger bill than when it was introduced.

## CHINESE-RUSSIAN CONVERGENCE IN ASIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for some time, I have been attempting to follow developments in Sino-Russian relations in central Asia. Although the public information is sparse and not necessarily always accurate, it has been possible to obtain from it, against the background of history, a glimmer of the situation which is evolving in that region.

Several weeks ago, I put together some observations on the central Asian situation which I had intended to discuss in the Senate on August 13. But I was hesitant to do so at the time because of a lack of any recent substantiating evidence of the tentative conclusions which I had reached.

In today's press, however, there are significant reports out of Tokyo which relate directly to the subject of my observations. I ask unanimous consent that a selection of these reports be included at the end of my remarks; and at this point, Mr. President, I ask the Senate's indulgence that I may proceed with the observations on the Chinese-Russian convergence in Asia to which I have previously referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are obvious reasons of health and skyrocketing costs of armaments which provide common or parallel motives for the Soviet Union and the United States to have sought the test ban treaty. Be-



yond the obvious, other interests have undoubtedly entered into the search for agreement by each nation. These are not necessarily shared interests but nevertheless they are a part of the calculations of the balance of benefit on which the treaty rests.

It seems to me that the Senate should explore all of these factors in an effort to understand fully what is at stake in the act of ratification. Reference, for example, has already been made in the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee to the growing estrangement between Russia and China. That the question has been raised suggests an awareness of what may be a most significant factor in the Soviet position on the nuclear test ban treaty. Yet our knowledge of the Russian-Chinese estrangement is too limited to permit a full comprehension of its implications either for Soviet policy or our own. For one thing, our reportorial coverage of the U.S.S.R., particularly east of the Urals, is extremely limited and spasmodic. For another, our knowledge of what is transpiring in China comes to us largely second or third hand.

It is understandable, therefore, that the Sino-Soviet estrangement has been analyzed in the press and elsewhere largely in theoretical terms. Scholars, journalists, and intelligence technicians pore over the documentation and statements and reports which emanate from Russia and China. And in this fashion, the estrangement is interpreted to the Nation almost wholly in terms of ideological differences and the struggle to claim the high priesthood of orthodoxy in the international Communist movement and with it, I suppose, the right to preach the eulogy at the burial of capitalism.

These ideological factors are undoubtedly deeply involved and I would not for a moment underestimate them. But if I may be so bold as to suggest it, it seems to me that the great emphasis which is given to them in the information which reaches the Government and the public may produce a serious distortion of our concept of the actual situation. We may see the problem largely as a clash of Marxist theories or Communist personalities which is destined to disappear as soon as the theories are straightened out or the present leaders, in time, go the way of all leaders.

I should like to suggest that other, more mundane and enduring considerations are involved in present Sino-Soviet difficulties, considerations which will not easily be exercised either by new theories or new leaders.

It is to one of these considerations that I direct the attention of the Senate today. It may well be the most significant factor, in the Russian-Chinese estrangement, largely overlooked in the overwhelming emphasis which has been given to the ideological differences between Moscow and Peking. I refer to the geographic and cultural convergence of Russia and China in the inner recesses of the Asian Continent.

This convergence, Mr. President, has been a source of intermittent friction between the two countries for a very long time. It has persisted irrespective of

the ideological inclinations of Moscow and Peiping at any given time in history. It long predates the advent of communism in China and even Russia. Indeed, it predates the birth of Karl Marx by at least a century.

The first recorded clashes between Russians and Chinese go back to the 17th century. Three hundred years ago, Russian traders and Cossacks first made contact with the outposts of Chinese-Manchu imperial power in the region north of Manchuria. The early zone of Russian influence and authority in this desolate northeast corner of Asia, as against China, was established by a series of treaties beginning with that of Nerchinsk in 1689, and followed by Bur and Kiakhta in 1727, Kiakhta in 1768, and the Kiakhta protocol in 1792. A half century later the Russian press southward was resumed under Count Nikolai Muraviev-Amursky, the Governor General of eastern Siberia, and his chief military aide, Capt. Gennadii Ivanovich Nevelskoi. Again there followed a consolidation of the Russian position, in the Treaty of Aigun of 1858. This agreement brought into Russian possession large areas of Northeast Asia which had previously been under Manchu control.

Subsequently, Russia as well as other European powers and Japan exacted by guile, bribery, or naked power, special economic privileges and territorial concessions from weak and corrupt imperial officials of China. By this process, the Russians penetrated south into Manchuria, establishing themselves at Dairen and Port Arthur on the Yellow Sea by the end of the 19th century and penetrating Korea which had been for a long time in a tributary relationship with Peiping.

Since that high-water mark, Russian influence in northeast Asia at the expense of China has fluctuated. In the face of a Japanese advance and the weakness of the early Soviet state, it receded. Under the communism of Stalin it advanced once more at the end of World War II. And under the communism of Khrushchev it receded once more after the Chinese Communists came to power in Peiping.

Our sources of information are insufficient to provide a clear delineation of where the present line of convergence may lie, as between Russian and Chinese influence in northeast Asia. We are not even sure of what the precise situation in this connection may be in Korea where we are deeply involved, let alone in Manchuria, of which we know very little. One thing is reasonably certain, however, the actual Russian-Chinese convergence does not bear much relationship to the border-delineations as shown on ordinary maps. It is also clear, in any event, that the convergence in the northeast is still much further south and east of any line which would have been recognized by a Ching emperor of the Manchu dynasty in the 17th century, the 18th, or early 19th century.

The recent history of the Chinese-Russian convergence in northeast Asia has been affected, of course, by the appearance of Communist ideology in Russia and China. But sufficient expe-

rience is now accumulated to suggest that the future history of the region will hardly be dominated by this factor.

And the history of the northeast, a history of Russian advance and recession and advance—sometimes warlike and imperious and sometimes peaceful and conciliatory—finds parallels elsewhere in central Asia. During the last century, for example, Mongolia was entirely under nominal Chinese sovereignty. It was largely the efforts of Russians under the czars coupled with the weakness of the later Manchu-Ching emperors which brought about a loosening of Chinese control over the vast stretches of land now identified as the Outer Mongolian People's Republic. And it was largely the same combination of Soviet strength and Chinese weakness under the Chinese National Republic which resulted in 1922, in the establishment of an Outer Mongolia, not only independent of China but brought progressively into a relationship, apparently in the nature of a protectorate, with the U.S.S.R.

South and west of Outer Mongolia we find in Sinkiang the same flow, ebb, and flow of Russian influence. Here, as elsewhere there was for centuries a tradition of Chinese suzerainty over small principalities of tribal peoples. But here as elsewhere this suzerainty has been quite devoid of significance in the absence of strong Chinese central power to assert it. Thus, in the last century, the southwest edges of Sinkiang were chipped away and added to what is now the contiguous territory of the U.S.S.R. And even as recently as World War II the Russians exercised for a time something close to indirect domination over principal trading centers and caravan junctions in Sinkiang.

Especially, since the advent of Chinese Communist control over the mainland, the line of convergence as between Russia and China in the Sinkiang area has apparently been pushed back westward once again. But how far and how firm this recession of Soviet influence has been, we do not really know with any degree of accuracy.

To recapitulate, Mr. President, I have sought to point out to the Senate, that, historically, there has been not a fixed but a shifting and uncertain line of convergence between Russia and China in the inner recesses of the Asian Continent. This line, Mr. President, is not necessarily the border as shown on contemporary maps but rather the changing extremity of the eastward and southward reach of Russian influence and the westernmost and northernmost extension of enforceable Chinese control.

Further, history indicates that while there have been periods of stalemate and recession, the overall pattern in the region for several centuries was that of Russian advance. It was an advance which paralleled roughly the spastic but steady decay of the Manchu-Ching dynasty through the reigns of a number of emperors. And it drew strength from the debilitation of the successor Chinese Republic in World War II and the collapse of the Japanese intrusion on the Asian mainland in that conflict.

What prompts me to make these observations at this time, Mr. President, is that they may be of more than historic interest in the light of the present Sino-Soviet estrangement. This break comes at a time when there has emerged in Peiping once again, a strong centralization of Chinese power. To be sure, the government which wields this power proclaims its Marxism. Indeed, it claims to be more Marxist than Moscow. Yet insofar as Chinese Marxism is expressed in practice on the borders of China, it appears to bear a remarkable resemblance to classic Chinese dynastic policy.

There are strong indications, for example, that the present Chinese Government is not disposed to regard any of its borders—at least none fixed after the time of the advanced decay of the Ching dynasty—as permanently constricting on the outward extension of its power. That such is the case is indicated by the Chinese assertion in Korea, in Vietnam, in Laos, in Tibet and beyond Tibet into Ladakh and the Northeast Frontier Agency at the two extremities of the Indian subcontinent.

What, then, of the Sino-Soviet border regions? Are these, too, to be affected by the reassertion of Chinese power? I have already referred to the recession of Soviet influence in Manchuria and Sinkiang, although to what extent and how voluntarily it has occurred, we do not know with any degree of precision. But whatever its extent, it would be a relatively minor recession should the Chinese assertion against the U.S.S.R., in time, parallel its policies with regard to Korea, Southeast Asia, and the Chinese-Indian border region. If there is this parallel then the Chinese claim against the U.S.S.R. could conceivably extend out of Sinkiang, through the Soviet Pamire to Afghanistan. It could also embrace all of Outer Mongolia and the Soviet Maritime Provinces along the Pacific. For these areas fell within the reach of Manchu China in the heyday of the dynasty.

It is interesting to note in this connection, Mr. President, that when Mr. Khrushchev, late last year, taunted the Chinese Communists for accepting the presence of colonialists in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macao while urging him to act against the United States, he was answered in an editorial on March 8 in the Chinese People's Daily and Red Flag which reads in part as follows:

During the hundred or so years preceding the victorious Chinese Revolution, the colonial and imperialistic powers—the United States of America, Great Britain, France, czarist Russia, Germany, Japan, Italy, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain, and Portugal—became unreservedly engaged in a campaign of aggression against China. They imposed on the various regimes of the old China numerous unequal treaties: The Treaty of Nanking in 1842; the Treaty of Aigun in 1858; the Treaty of Tsientsin in 1858; the Treaty of Peiping in 1860; the Treaty of Ill in 1881; the Convention for the Extension of Hong Kong in 1898; the Treaty of 1901; etc. By virtue of these unequal treaties, they annexed Chinese territory in the north, south, east, and west; or they caused territories to be ceded to them on lease along the coast of China and even in

the Chinese hinterland. When the People's Republic of China was founded in 1949, our Government clearly stated its intention of eventually reexamining all the treaties concluded by previous Chinese regimes with foreign governments and, according to their respective texts, either recognizing, denouncing, revising or renegotiating them at the appropriate time.

Note, Mr. President, the reference in this catalog of unequal treaties to the Treaty of Aigun which fixed the present-day boundaries in Manchuria at China's expense and to Russia's advantage. And note in conjunction therewith this paragraph in the same editorial:

Certain persons (an obvious reference to Mr. Khrushchev) would like us to raise the question of the unequal treaties here and now \* \* \*. Have they realized what the consequences of this might be?

The implication is clear, Mr. President. The Chinese regard certain Soviet territories, no less than Hong Kong and Macao and Formosa, as having been taken inequitably from China and subject, therefore, to Chinese claim.

Now, Mr. President, I do not wish to leave the impression that China is about to embark upon a general war with Russia to bring back into the historic embrace of Peiping, certain lands along the inner Asian borders. But I do suggest that the arrow tips of Chinese influence are already pointed outward from Peiping into these sparsely inhabited regions whose predominant population is neither Chinese nor Russian but Mongol and other tribal peoples. Many techniques are already apparently operating to this end, including the Chinese aid programs in Outer Mongolia and the organization of autonomous tribal groupings on Chinese territory. Certainly, such limited information as we have with respect to the region hints at the likelihood that the Chinese arrows have begun to prick the Russians in these remote regions.

I would suggest further, Mr. President, that Soviet foreign policy is not formed in ignorance of these recent developments or the history which I have just recounted, or of the actions of the Chinese in southeast Asia and on the Indian border. And there is no reason to assume that, because it is Communist, Russian foreign policy is concerned any less with such considerations than might be the case with the foreign policy of any other nation.

I would suggest, finally, that it is becoming apparent that we have been in error in assuming for so long that the iron hand of Moscow was so unshakably fixed on Peiping that it had superseded all other factors for all time in the considerations of the Communist leaders in China. Theoretical Communist world unity, whatever its weight, has not replaced certain enduring factors in the relationships of Russia and China as they are indicated to us by history.

And one of these factors, perhaps the most significant, as I have tried to explain to the Senate today, is the convergence of Russian and Chinese influence in the vast inner recesses of Asia. The problems which are posed

by the convergence are not essentially those of Marxist theory. And they certainly are not those of a common border dispute, that is, whether to move the markers a few yards or a few miles in one direction or the other. What is involved is the ultimate disposition and utilization of a reserve of millions of square miles of territory largely devoid of human habitation.

This land and its contents constitute an enormous and largely unexplored and unexploited resource. Heretofore, it may have been of minor importance because of the inadequacies in techniques of modern development and transportation, particularly in that part of the world. But with the rapid dissemination and multiplication of these techniques, the region grows rapidly in significance to the two great peoples which converge upon it. And it grows, too, in significance as the population of China, already in the vicinity of 700 million, and growing at the rate of 13 million to 15 million a year, expands explosively and presses ever more heavily on limited resources even for a bare minimum of food, clothing, and shelter.

So, Mr. President, if we wish to understand fully the motives of the Soviet Union in seeking a nuclear test ban treaty, we ought not to overlook the factor of the Sino-Soviet convergence, a factor which is clearly indicated by history but which cannot be weighed accurately without a better understanding of what is presently transpiring in interior Asia.

In any event, it would be unwise to dismiss the likelihood of a growth of tension at various points of contact along the thousands of miles of this vague frontier. Some might anticipate with relish the prospects of these clashes, even if they were nuclear. That prospect might be bent and twisted, I suppose, into an argument against the proposed treaty to ban nuclear tests.

But that, Mr. President, would be a most distorted view of nuclear realities and contemporary international relations. For if the flames of a great nuclear conflagration are lit, it will matter little who holds the match or where in the world it is struck. Even the vastness of central Asia would be insufficient to contain the holocaust or to confine it to the two massive Communist powers of Eurasia. No, Mr. President, the probability of increasing tension in the Sino-Soviet convergence, as in the case of all significant international tensions, is one more reason for seeking to bring about rational control over the growth and spread of the immense destructive power of nuclear weapons.

Rather than an argument against this treaty, then, this probable tension in Sino-Soviet relations is an argument for this Nation to seek to improve its comprehension of the actual situation which exists in central Asia. For that region and what transpires in it is likely to have a most profound significance in a world in which the peace and security of this Nation is closely interwoven with that of all others.



## EXHIBIT 1

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 6, 1963]

**PEIPING ACCUSES MOSCOW OF PLOT TO STIR UPRISING IN CHINA AREA, SEES TWO NATIONS ON BRINK OF SPLIT**

TOKYO, September 6.—The Chinese Communists accused the Soviet Union today of trying to foment an uprising in Red China with the aid of tens of thousands of Chinese in a remote Sinkiang-Soviet borderland. They said Soviet-Chinese relations have reached "the brink of a split."

The Chinese reported the alleged Soviet Trojan horse plot against Red China in broadcasts which said differences in the international Communist movement have reached "a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

A broadcast monitored here said the Russians admitted tens of thousands of Chinese into Soviet territory last year in an attempt to overthrow the Chinese local government at Ili, a district bordering the Soviet Union in northwest Sinkiang Province. The area in central Asia was occupied by imperial Russia in 1861-1870.

## FIRST MENTION

The accusation was the first mention of incidents along the thousands of miles of border separating the squabbling giants of communism.

The radio said the Chinese were "allured" or "threatened" to induce them to join a plot by Soviet officials in Sinkiang under order of the Soviet Communist Party. It gave no other details of the alleged plot except to say that the Chinese Government had made several protests to the Russians for the return of the Chinese and had been refused.

The matter has not been settled, it added. Peiping accused the Kremlin of fostering a "two Chinas" policy. In the new massive verbal attack on the Soviet leadership the Chinese also took the credit for the crushing of the Hungarian revolt in the fall of 1956.

## SOVIET TAUNT

From the Moscow side of the verbal barricades came a taunt from Ilya Ehrenburg, Soviet writer, that the Chinese are bent on instigating a global nuclear conflict which they would sit out as spectators and hope to survive as "victors."

Peiping's charges were in broadcasts of a statement published in both the official People's Daily and the Communist Party's theoretical journal, Red Flag. The statement was in answer to Moscow's July 15 accusation that China was trying to set up new world headquarters for communism in Peking and split the world along racial lines.

The Chinese charged that in 1956, "at the critical moment when the Hungarian counterrevolutionaries had occupied Budapest," the Soviet leaders for a time "intended to adopt a policy of capitulation and abandon Socialist [Communist] Hungary to counterrevolution."

"We insisted on the taking of all the necessary measures to smash the counterrevolutionary rebellion," the Chinese said.

Soviet tanks and troops crushed the revolution with an attack on Budapest in November 1956.

The Chinese claimed Premier Khrushchev proposed 4 years ago that they accept the "two Chinas" theory and acknowledge the rule of the Nationalists on Formosa. As far as the record shows at the United Nations, however, Russia has violently opposed the "two Chinas" formula for resolving the question of Chinese representation.

The Chinese charge was contained in a little-noted section of Peiping's reply Sunday to Soviet charges August 21 that Communist China's enmity resulted from a Soviet refusal to give that country atomic weapons.

The statement also repeated claims that Soviet leaders had raised the quarrel from

the Communist Party to Government level. The border troubles, recall of Soviet specialists and tearing up of hundreds of contracts proved this, it said.

It also repeated charges of "great power chauvinism"—another way of writing, "Do what I say because I'm stronger than you"—against the Russians and accused them of otherwise violating the norms of interparty relations.

There was no immediate Soviet reply to the Chinese charges and the grave assessment of relations.

The official Government newspaper Izvestia, however, kept up the drumfire of Moscow's propaganda against China. It spoke of the "empty talk of the Chinese leaders" and alleged their view was that "Communist society will be made up of people who have lofty ideals but empty stomachs."

"It is difficult to conceive a greater mistake," Izvestia wrote.

## A WHOLE SERIES

The Chinese editorial said the Soviet "errors are not just accidental, individual and minor errors, but a whole series of errors of principle which endanger the interests of the entire Socialist camp and international Communist movement."

It said they dated from Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February, 1956, and his simultaneous proclamation of a new Communist dogma—that war is no longer inevitable.

After boasting of how hard their own leaders had tried to avoid a split, the core of the Chinese article said:

"Nevertheless, the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) leaders are determined 'to go our own way' and have pushed Sino-Soviet relations to the brink of split and have carried the differences in the international Communist movement to a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

## RENEGADE TITO

The article bitterly accused the Soviet Union allying itself "with the United States against China" and also with the "renegade Tito" (President Tito of Yugoslavia).

One of the ways the Kremlin tried to curry favor with the United States, Peiping's Sunday statement said, was recommending acceptance of the Nationalist regime on Formosa.

The Chinese Government said Khrushchev made his suggestion in October 1959, following his visit to the United States. Shortly after his return he went to Peiping for secret talks with Mao Tse-tung, Chinese Red boss, during Red China's 10th anniversary celebrations.

Such a Khrushchev proposal could account for the extraordinary chill which descended on the Peiping visit and the absence of a formal communique when it ended.

Khrushchev is said to have compared Formosa to the Far Eastern Republic which existed between 1920 and 1922 after the Russian Revolution, and to have noted that Lenin had recognized it. It eventually was taken over by Russia.

## CHINA BUILDS DEFENSES ON ITS RUSSIAN BORDER

HONG KONG, September 5.—Communist China has sent 900,000 students to build defenses in Sinkiang Province bordering the Soviet Union, the South China Morning Post reported today.

The British-owned, English-language paper quoted a refugee from Red China as saying the volunteers included more than 30,000 students from Shanghai who responded "to have something to do." Most were junior middle school students who couldn't get into senior middle schools because of limited accommodations, he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 6, 1963]

**PEIPING SEES SPLIT WITH RUSSIA NEAR AFTER BORDER PLOT**

TOKYO, September 6.—Communist China said today that its relations with the Soviet Union have reached "the brink of split," in part because the Russians have been "provoking troubles on the Sino-Soviet border."

A Peiping broadcast monitored here charged that last April and May there was a Soviet plot to overthrow a local Chinese district government in the Ili district in Sinkiang Province, which borders on the Soviet Union.

The Peiping radio broadcast the charge in a long statement that declared that differences in the Soviet-Chinese relationship have reached "a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

The broadcast also charged that the Soviet Union wanted to "adopt a policy of capitulation" in the 1956 Hungarian revolution, but gave up the idea under strong Chinese pressure.

## FIRST REVELATION

The border row, the first to be formally revealed by either nation, involved tens of thousands of Chinese who were admitted into Soviet territory, it was alleged, in April and May 1962.

The radio said the Chinese were "allured" or "threatened" to induce them to join a plot by Soviet officials in Sinkiang under order of the Soviet Communist Party. It gave no other details of the alleged plot except to say that the Chinese Government had made several protests to the Russians for return of the Chinese and had been refused.

The matter has not been settled, it added.

The radio quoted an article jointly published by the editorial departments of the official People's Daily and the theoretical journal Red Flag.

The statement answered Moscow's July 15 accusation that China was trying to set up a new world headquarters for communism in Peiping and split the world along racial lines.

## FLIGHT WAS REPORTED

The Washington Post reported last June that between 50,000 and 70,000 refugees from Communist China had fled into the Soviet Union in the spring of 1962. At the same time, groups of Chinese clamored in front of the Soviet consulate at Kuldja, in Sinkiang Province, demanding arms to fight the Peiping regime, but apparently none were given them. Kuldja is the main city in the Ili district.

The border district of Ili was occupied by Imperial Russia for 10 years, 1861-70, and then reverted to central Asian somnolence. The district was attached in 1944-50 to a makeshift East Turkestan Republic. The main town, Kuldja, home of about 150,000 people, trades in tea and cattle, has industries such as tanning and textiles, and there are iron and coal mines about.

The Chinese article also claimed that for a time during the 1956 Hungarian revolt, the Russians "intended to abandon Socialist Hungary to counterrevolution."

"The Chinese Communist Party at that time resolutely opposed these erroneous methods and advanced correct suggestions," it said.

The Russian leaders, it said, adopted these suggestions, "but subsequent events showed that they nursed rancor against the Chinese Communist Party."

## "CHAUVINISM" CHARGED

It said the Soviet Party had also committed "the error of great-power chauvinism" in handling "incident in Soviet-Polish relations" in the same period.

During the Hungarian revolt, the Soviet Union for a time did appear to be trying to come to terms with the regime of Imre Nagy

by sending Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan to Budapest for secret talks. But after Nagy said he would take Hungary out of the Warsaw Pact, Red army tanks were sent into the country and the revolt was crushed in a blood bath. Nagy later was executed.

In Poland, however, Wladislaw Gomulka, then as now the No. 1 Communist, reportedly threatened to go on the air and call for an uprising against the Red army. Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev apparently backed down and permitted the Gomulka regime, which had come to power in the October revolt against former Stalinist rulers, to remain in office.

The article said Khrushchev "took the lead in organizing a large-scale surprise onslaught on the Chinese Communist Party" at the Rumanian Communist Party congress at Bucharest in 1960.

The Chinese delegation there signed a communique after the meeting "for the sake of the larger interest," but distributed a statement saying the future of communism "will never be decided by the baton of any individual."

#### CRITICISM REPORTED

At the Soviet Party congress in 1961, the article said, when Soviet leaders attacked the policies of the Albanian Party, Chinese Premier Chou En-lai "frankly criticized the errors of the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party in subsequent conversations with Khrushchev."

But Khrushchev flatly turned down these criticisms and advice, and openly said: "We shall go our own way."

The Chinese warning of a possible break between Moscow and Peking was the most somber picture painted yet of relations between the two Red giants.

In its latest article, Peking also accused the Russians of enlarging the Soviet-Chinese quarrel to government level.

"Having failed to subdue the Chinese Communist Party, the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union took a series of steps to extend the ideological differences between the Soviet and Chinese Parties to the sphere of state relations—the recall of all the Soviet experts in China, the tearing up of hundreds of agreements and contracts, and the provoking of troubles on the Sino-Soviet border," the article said.

It also said "the past 7 years have amply proved that the road taken by the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the course of allying with imperialism against socialism, allying with the United States against China, allying with the reactionaries of all countries against the people of the world, and allying with the renegade Tito (President Tito of Yugoslavia) clique against fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties."

#### DANGER SEEN WIDE

Peking said the Soviet "errors are not just accidental, individual and minor errors, but a whole series of errors of principle which endanger the interests of the entire Socialist camp and international Communist movement."

It said they dated from Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin at the 20th congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February 1956, and his simultaneous proclamation of a new Communist dogma—that war is no longer inevitable.

After boasting of how hard their own leaders had tried to avoid a split, the core of the Chinese article said:

"Nevertheless, the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) leaders are determined 'to go our own way' and have pushed Sino-Soviet relations to the brink of split and have carried the differences in the international Communist movement to a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

#### TAIWAN MOVE NOTED

One of the ways the Kremlin tried to curry favor with the United States, was

recommending acceptance of the Nationalist regime on Taiwan, the article said.

This charge was contained in a little-noted section of Peking's reply last Sunday to Soviet charges August 21 that Red China's enmity resulted from a Soviet refusal to give China atomic weapons.

In the Sunday reply, Peking said Khrushchev made his "two-China" suggestion in October 1959, after his visit to the United States. Shortly after his return, he went to Peking for talks with Mao during Red China's 10th anniversary celebrations.

Such a Khrushchev proposal could account for the extraordinary chill that descended on the Peking visit and the absence of a formal communique when it ended.

Khrushchev is said to have compared Taiwan to the Far Eastern Republic that existed between 1920 and 1922 after the Russian revolution, and said that Lenin had recognized it. It eventually was taken over by the Soviet Union.

The Far Eastern Republic was a buffer state that had a semi-autonomous existence from late 1920 until it was merged into the Russian Federated Republic in November 1922. It was under Soviet control and had the closest possible relations with the Soviet Union before the formal merger.

#### SUNDAY STATEMENT

Peking's Sunday statement said:

"We have not forgotten and will not forget what the Soviet leader, Khrushchev, said about the question of Taiwan after his visit to the United States in October 1959."

"He said the question of Taiwan was an incendiary factor in the international situation and that because the United States supported Chiang Kai-shek and the Soviet Union supported China, there resulted the atmosphere of an imminent great war. But what the Soviet Union stood for was the creation of all conditions to ease international tension and eliminate war."

"He further said that there was more than one way to solve every complicated question, depending on what basis you took. For example, after the October revolution, there was established in the Soviet Far East the Far Eastern Republic, and Lenin recognized it at the time; this was a temporary concession and sacrifice, but later on it was united with Russia."

"The meaning of this statement by the Soviet leader was quite clear. To put it bluntly, this was to ask China to agree to the U.S. scheme of creating two Chinas."

"This absurd view, of course, was rebutted and rejected by China, whereupon the Soviet leader made a series of speeches hinting that China was 'craving for war like a cock for a fight, and, like Trotsky, wanted neither peace nor war.'"

The statement then charged that "in accordance with the procedure mutually agreed upon by the Soviet Union and the United States," Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist China has signed the nuclear test ban treaty "and is swaggering as if it were a sovereign state."

The Chinese further charged that not only had Khrushchev asked Red China to sign the treaty, which it has refused to do, "thus to create a situation of two Chinas," but "he also has threatened that if the Chinese Communist Government opposed this treaty and refused to be bound by it, the United States would help the Chiang Kai-shek clique to manufacture nuclear weapons. It turns out that in order to 'save millions of Chinese from nuclear death,' one China has to become two Chinas."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1963]

#### PEIPING ACCUSES MOSCOW OF PLOT

TOKYO, September 6.—Communist China accused the Soviet Union today of having marshaled tens of thousands of Chinese in a plot to overthrow the regional government of a district along the Soviet border.

The Peiping radio, reporting a new attack on Soviet policies by the Chinese Communists, said that the Soviet Union's actions had brought the relations between the two countries to the brink of a split.

The differences in the international Communist movement, the broadcast said, have reached a "new stage of unprecedented gravity."

The Peiping radio said the Russians admitted thousands of Chinese into Soviet territory in the spring of 1962 in an attempt to overthrow the local government at Ili, a district in northwest Sinkiang Province.

The broadcast quoted an article published by the Peiping newspaper Jenmin Jih Pav and the magazine Hung Chi, both official organs of the Chinese Communist Party.

The article was in reply to a Moscow accusation, published July 15, that China was trying to set up new world headquarters for communism in Peking and split the world along racial lines.

In the border incident, the Russians were said to have lured or threatened the Chinese to join the plot.

The broadcast gave no other details of the alleged plot except to say that the Chinese Government had made several demands to Moscow for the return of the Chinese and had been rebuffed.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1963]

#### ARTICLE DENOUNCES MOSCOW

(Special to the New York Times)

HONG KONG, September 5.—Communist China accused the Soviet Union today of deliberate policies to aggravate relations between the two countries.

The charge was made in an article jointly prepared by the newspaper Jenmin Jih Pao and the magazine Hung Chi, organs of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

Hsinhua, the Chinese Communist press agency, reported that the article was the first in a series commenting on the Soviet Communist Party's open letter, published July 14, attacking Chinese Communist policies.

The first article in Peking's reply, Hsinhua said, consists of more than 20,000 Chinese characters and "cites a vast number of documents and irrefutable facts to show that since the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party (1956) the process in which Soviet leadership has gone further and further down the road of revisionism and 'splitism' is the very process that has widened and aggravated the differences in the international Communist movement."

The facts of the last 7 years have amply proved, the article continued, that the Soviet leadership has taken the course of "allying with imperialism against socialism, allying with the United States against China . . . and allying with the renegade Tito clique against fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties."

The Chinese Communists said that the widening breach in the international Communist movement had begun at the 20th congress. It was at this meeting of the Soviet Communist Party that Premier Khrushchev exposed to the delegates the extent of Stalin's repressions and abuses of power.

From the outset, the article added, the Chinese have held that a number of the views advanced at the congress, "particularly the complete negation of Stalin and the thesis of 'peaceful transition' are gross errors of principle."

Hsinhua said the article exposed the "error of great power chauvinism" committed by the Soviet leadership in attempting to suppress the liberalization movement in Poland in the face of 1956. At that time, Premier Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders made a hasty flight to Warsaw in an attempt to prevent Wladyslaw Gomulka, a nationalist, from taking over the leadership of the Polish Communist Party.



## CAPITULATION CHARGED

The article accused Moscow of capitulation in its shortlived acceptance of the Imre Nagy regime set up during the Hungarian revolt in 1956. After several days the Russians violated their pledge to negotiate an agreement, crushed the rebellion and arrested Mr. Nagy. He was executed in 1958.

"With regard to the counterrevolutionary rebellion in Hungary," the article said, "for a time Soviet leadership intended to adopt a policy of capitulation and abandon Socialist Hungary to counterrevolution." The Chinese Communist Party at that time resolutely opposed these erroneous methods and advanced correct suggestions.

The article said the Soviet leaders had accepted the Chinese suggestions "but subsequent events showed that they nursed rancor against the Chinese Communist Party and regarded its perseverance in proletarian internationalism as the biggest obstacle to the Soviet party's wrong line."

The article was the first indication by Peiping that it had urged the use of force to put down the Hungarian rebellion.

The latest attack on the Soviet leadership by Peiping repeats many of the accusations made in the course of the deterioration of relations between the two countries, but it did give a few new glimpses of behind-the-scenes developments.

## ISSUES DISCUSSED IN 1961

Referring to the Soviet Party's 22d congress in 1961, at which the Albanian Communist regime was first publicly attacked by Soviet bloc leaders, the article said that Premier Chou En-lai, who defended the Albanians, had "frankly criticized the errors of the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party in subsequent conversations with Khrushchev."

"But Khrushchev flatly turned down these criticisms and advice," the article added, "and openly stated that 'We shall go our own way,' showing not the slightest intention of mending their ways."

The Chinese press agency said the article listed 10 main facts to show that since the 22d congress the Soviet leadership had become "more unbridled in violating the principles guiding relations among the fraternal parties and countries and in pursuing policies of great power chauvinism, sectarianism and splittism to promote its own line of revisionism."

The article appealed to the Soviet leadership to "correct its errors and return to the path of Marxism-Leninism."

[From the New York Herald Tribune,  
Sept. 6, 1963]

## BATTLING RED GIANTS—AT THE BRINK

TOKYO.—Communist China harshly accused the Soviet Union yesterday of pushing the two Communist giants "to the brink of split" by committing "a whole series of errors of principle."

Couching its charges in the peculiarly stilted language of Marxist vituperation, Peiping broadcast a detailed and lengthy indictment of Moscow and warned that differences within the international Communist movement have reached "a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

The 2-hour radio broadcast, monitored in Tokyo, was an English translation of a 20,000-character editorial statement printed simultaneously yesterday by Peiping's official People's Daily and the theoretical journal Red Flag.

As news of the double-barreled attack on the Kremlin reached the West, there were also reports of an unprecedented anti-Chinese demonstration in front of Peiping's Embassy in Moscow.

Heading the list of Chinese grievances against the Soviets was the charge of "provoking troubles on the Sino-Soviet frontier." This was the first official acknowledgment of

incidents along the thousands of miles of shared border between the two countries.

But there have been rumors of trouble in China's Sinkiang Province, and Peiping yesterday accused Moscow of attempting to overthrow the local government at Ili, a district bordering the Soviet Union in the northwestern corner of Sinkiang.

The radio said tens of thousands of Chinese were admitted to Soviet territory in furtherance of the plot in April and May of 1962. Peiping's request for the return of the Chinese had been refused, it added.

In Hong Kong yesterday, the English-language South China Post published a report from a Red Chinese refugee that 900,000 students have been sent to Sinkiang to build defenses.

But the Sinkiang question was only one point in a bill of particulars stretching back to 1956. The joint article yesterday was the first in a series catchily entitled "The Origin and Development of Differences Between Ourselves and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

Moscow's "errors of principle" began, according to the Peiping broadcast, as long ago as 1956, at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. "From the very outset," it said, China opposed "the complete negation of Stalin and the thesis of 'peaceful transition' as 'gross errors.'"

Yesterday's broadcast also charged that Soviet Premier Khrushchev was ready to compromise with the rebels in Hungary in 1956 but yielded to Chinese insistence that the uprising be put down: "The Chinese Communist Party at that time resolutely opposed these erroneous methods and advanced correct suggestions."

The broadcast continued: "The past 7 years have amply proved that the road taken by the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the course of allying with imperialism against socialism, allying with the United States against China, allying with the reactionaries of all countries against the people of the world and allying with the renegade Tito clique against fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties."

The entire sweeping denunciation of Soviet policy was a counterchallenge to Moscow's open letter of July 14, which accused Peiping of trying to split the Soviet bloc and subvert it. Since then, of course, Premier Khrushchev has gone out of his way to mend his fences with the "renegade" President Tito of Yugoslavia.

"Having failed to subdue the Chinese Communist Party," yesterday's broadcast continued, the Russians moved "to extend the ideological differences . . . to the sphere of state relations." Besides the border provocations, this stage included the withdrawal of Soviet experts in China and the "tearing up of hundreds of agreements and contracts."

The broadcast also gave broader emphasis to a charge the Chinese first made last Sunday—that Premier Khrushchev proposed 4 years ago that Peiping settle for "two Chinas" and acknowledge Nationalist control of Formosa. The proposal was made, the Chinese said, after Mr. Khrushchev visited the United States in 1959.

In Moscow, where there was no reply to the Chinese propaganda fusillade, the Chinese Ambassador's limousine was parked outside the Soviet Foreign Ministry yesterday. The Chinese earlier had protested a demonstration at the Embassy by a score of Moscow University students urging the Chinese to sign the partial nuclear test ban treaty. The Chinese labeled the demonstration an "organized provocation."

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OPPOSE  
AID TO NASSER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Jewish War Veterans of the United

States, which is the oldest active war veterans' association in the United States, has indicated strong opposition to any further assistance to the United Arab Republic in view of President Nasser's aggressive military activities. In a letter to the President, Commander Heller, national head of the JWV, cited Nasser's August 11 statement that the United Arab Republic's economic structure was "strong" and he could afford to spend close to 12 percent of his budget on the armed forces.

Mr. President, there is, to my way of thinking, no reason in the world why the U.S. taxpayers should in any way subsidize Nasser's military buildup against the State of Israel. Nasser's plans are obviously offensive and not defensive.

Mr. President, I have supported the foreign aid program of our Nation in the past and, unless I am shown very compelling evidence to the contrary, I expect to support it this year. However, it is clearly absurd to permit U.S. aid to be used not for economic development but for the personal ambitions and aggressions of President Nasser, directed against Israel and even other neighboring Arab States. There is presently language in the aid bill passed by the House which, although not entirely satisfactory, does seek to limit the use of U.S. aid for this kind of militaristic activity. I shall do everything in my power to insure that that language remains in the Senate version and, if possible, is strengthened.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD the text of a press release issued by the Jewish Veterans on this subject.

The Jewish War Veterans are a well-informed, responsible group. They have served their country without hesitation in time of war. In time of peace I believe their position deserves the consideration and careful attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JWV OPPOSES FURTHER AID TO UNITED ARAB  
REPUBLIC

WASHINGTON.—National Commander Daniel Neal Heller, of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., today informed President Kennedy that while the Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., supports restoration of House cuts in the foreign assistance bill, the organization is unalterably opposed to any further or additional assistance to the United Arab Republic in view of that country's aggressive military expenditures.

Commander Heller, in a letter to President Kennedy, cited Colonel Nasser's August 11 statement that the United Arab Republic economic structure was now so strong that he could divert "12 percent of our budget on the armed forces." Colonel Nasser went on to announce what appear to be preparations for war against Israel.

According to Mr. Heller, "Nasser's economic structure is so heavily subsidized by American assistance programs that the United Arab Republic is able to spend lavish sums on rockets, for offensive purposes and for the purchase of Soviet jet bombers and other Russian equipment as well as for the training of Egyptian officers in Soviet Union military bases."

Mr. Heller pointed out in detail how the United States propped up the Egyptian economy while Nasser increased his arms buildup, even hiring ex-Nazi rocket scientists.

Commenting on State Department claims that the United States should continue the massive aid to Nasser because America allegedly enjoys new "influence" in Cairo, Mr. Heller asked: "What evidence is there that we have such influence and that it has been effectively used?"

Mr. Heller noted that, "In recent days, both Egypt and Syria have perpetrated aggressive infiltrations into Israeli territory. The border situation is more volatile than at any time in recent years. Nasser and his Arab henchmen are growing bolder."

President Kennedy was informed of the Jewish War Veterans position that, "While we support our foreign assistance program generally, we have reached a conclusion that we must oppose further aid to the Nasser regime until Nasser's aggressive preparations, including acquisition of massive offensive Soviet weapons, are terminated."

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America is the oldest active war veterans organization in the United States.

### THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on June 10, at the commencement exercises of the American University here in Washington, President Kennedy delivered an address, entitled "Toward a Strategy of Peace," that was billed by the White House as one of his most important foreign policy statements since his inauguration. That, it certainly was. In it the President called upon the American people to reexamine their attitudes toward the Soviet Union and toward the cold war. Clearly this represented a major new departure in the course of American foreign policy, coming as it did barely 8 months after the President had caught the Soviets in the deceitful act of installing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems in Cuba, next door to the United States.

His apparent success in facing down Khrushchev over the presence of Soviet strategic offensive weaponry in Cuba raised the hopes of the President and of his foreign policy advisers that perhaps we had reached a major and heartening turning point in our relations with the Soviet Union and in the course of the cold war. These hopes were further raised by Khrushchev's expression, at the turn of the year, of his willingness to agree to three on-site inspections annually on Soviet territory to investigate suspicious events in connection with an agreed ban on nuclear testing in all environments.

The President and his advisers apparently concluded that Khrushchev, after having gone perilously close to the brink of the thermonuclear war the previous October, was at last, after more than 4 years of intermittent negotiations, ready to agree to a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing.

But the administration's optimism was dampened soon thereafter. The United States, which had already made several successive concessions on the number of on-site inspections to enforce a ban on underground nuclear testing, refused to reduce the number below seven. More significant and dismaying, however, was Khrushchev's unwillingness to agree on the other essential features of an inspection system, including the composition of inspection teams and their functions.

As winter melted into spring, it became clear to the President that the nuclear test ban negotiations at Geneva had reached an impasse. Faced with this impasse, President Kennedy throughout the spring voiced his growing concern over the failure of the Americans, British, and Russians to reach an accord on a comprehensive test ban, and he expressed his alarm at what he regarded as increasingly dangerous prospects for the spread of nuclear weapon production and delivery capabilities to other nations not presently possessing them.

This was the setting of the President's "Strategy of Peace" address. Just before his speech, President Kennedy had persuaded Khrushchev to agree to a high-level British-American-Soviet meeting in Moscow to make a final striving for a treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments. In his speech, the President announced the forthcoming Moscow meeting and, to demonstrate the earnestness of American intentions, he declared that the United States would withhold testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere so long as other powers did likewise in the hope that this act would facilitate agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty.

Hardly had the President finished speaking, it seems in retrospect, and before we Americans could digest his advice, we had a treaty. Not the comprehensive ban we had sought, but a treaty nevertheless. On July 2, less than a month after the President's speech, Khrushchev announced his government's readiness to conclude a treaty banning nuclear testing in all environments except underground. On July 15, the Moscow conference previously called for by the President convened. Ten days later the treaty that Khrushchev was ready to accept was initialed.

This was a remarkable turn of events which, I confess, left me and, I suspect, others breathless. I realize, of course, that negotiations on a test ban treaty had been going on for nearly 5 years. Nevertheless, I was taken aback by the haste in which the treaty now before the Senate was concluded.

Evidence of this haste can be seen principally in two features of the treaty.

The first feature is its preamble. It is interesting to compare the preamble to the treaty now before us with the preamble to the draft treaty proposed at Geneva by the United States and the United Kingdom on August 27, 1962 a little more than a year ago. The preamble to the August 27 draft reads as follows:

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America,

Desirous of bringing about the permanent discontinuance of all nuclear weapon test explosions and determined to continue negotiations to this end,

Confident that immediate discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, and in the oceans will facilitate progress toward the early agreement providing for the permanent and verified discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in all environments,

Have agreed as follows:

This statement, as we can see, is quite modest. The parties merely express

their intention to conclude a comprehensive test ban treaty and express their belief that the partial test ban will pave the way toward that end.

Now, listen to the preamble to the test ban treaty that is before this body:

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances,

Have agreed as follows:

This preamble goes considerably farther than that contained in the August 27 draft. It gives great play to the sweeping goal of "general and complete disarmament," the Soviet line initiated 4 years ago by Khrushchev and subsequently adopted by President Kennedy. I have always felt that it is dangerous to tempt the average man in the street anywhere with such a utopian objective as this. Such temptations encourage false hopes and can cause profound dismay if not realized. I am happy that my viewpoint is shared by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me repeat his wise admonition voiced last April in a lecture before the student body of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University:

Unlike the test ban negotiations, for which there seems to be at least a possibility of success, the discussion of "general and complete disarmament" is, in my opinion, an exercise in cold war fantasy, a manifestation of the deception and pretense of the new diplomacy. In a world profoundly divided by ideological conflict and national rivalries—conditions which are almost certain to prevail for the foreseeable future—it is inconceivable that the world's foremost antagonists could suddenly and miraculously dispel their animosities and vest in each other the profound trust and confidence which general and complete disarmament would require. There is nothing but mischief in negotiations which no statesman seriously expects to succeed. They become a forum for the generation of false hopes and profound disappointments, a cold war battleground for the exchange of epithets and accusations of bad faith in the face of certain failure. The net result is to reinforce the mirror image of mistrust and animosity through which the two societies (Russia and America) see each other.

So, Mr. President, in our apparently hasty eagerness to conclude a partial test ban treaty, we and our British ally apparently were willing to substitute this sweeping call for "general and complete disarmament" for the more modest and sensible, as well as more relevant, preamble contained in our draft of August 27, 1962. The preamble to the treaty before us echoes one of the major themes of Communist propaganda which, regrettably, the United States endorsed



2 years ago. Some will say, perhaps, that this is of no consequence because the preamble is not the operational part of the treaty. But it does unduly and, in my view, unnecessarily raise the hopes of mankind for something that, in my opinion, is utopian and highly unlikely of attainment so long as the nature of man remains as it has throughout recorded history.

The second feature of the treaty before us that exemplifies the evident haste in which the treaty was negotiated is the ambiguous phrase, "or any other nuclear explosion," which appears twice in article I of the treaty, particularly in paragraph 2 of that article, and which has stirred considerable discussion, questioning, and debate ever since the hearings on this treaty began in the Foreign Relations Committee. Two days after the treaty was initiated in Moscow, the New York Times authoritatively reported that some legal experts in the Department of State were concerned over the legal implications of that phrase, particularly with its effect upon the right of the United States to use nuclear weapons in hostilities. For this reason, the Times reported, President Kennedy inserted a statement in his speech to the Nation of July 26, reserving our right to use nuclear weapons in war. The doubts raised by this phrase have forced the highest officials of this Government, including the President, to give their solemn assurances that the United States will not be inhibited by this treaty from using nuclear weapons in hostilities in which it may become involved. Such confusion might have been avoided had this article of the treaty been more carefully drafted to insure unmistakable clarity. Article I of the British-American draft of August 27, 1962, was clear in this respect. But we have been told by the legal adviser of the Department of State that the Soviets flatly rejected in the Moscow discussions article II of that draft which dealt with explosions for peaceful purposes. Consequently he explained the controversial phrase I quoted earlier was inserted into the present treaty. Despite the legal adviser's explanation of the origin of this phrase, I stand by my contention that it bears the earmarks of haste to conclude the treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the texts of the Anglo-American draft treaty proposed on August 27, 1962, and the treaty now before us.

There being no objection, the texts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**DRAFT TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS IN ATMOSPHERE, OUTER SPACE, AND UNDERWATER**

(Presented to the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament August 27, 1962, Geneva, Switzerland, by the United Kingdom and United States of America)

**PREAMBLE**

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, hereinafter referred to as the "original Parties,"

Desirous of bringing about the permanent discontinuance of all nuclear weapon test ex-

plosions and determined to continue negotiations to this end,

Confident that immediate discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, and in the oceans will facilitate progress toward the early agreement providing for the permanent and verified discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in all environments,

Have agreed as follows:

**ARTICLE I**

**Obligations**

1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit and prevent the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

a. in the atmosphere, above the atmosphere, or in territorial or high seas; or

b. in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the State under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect proscribed, in paragraph 1 of this Article.

**ARTICLE II**

**Explosions for peaceful purposes**

The explosion of any nuclear device for peaceful purposes which would take place in any of the environments described, or would have the effect proscribed, in paragraph 1 of Article I may be conducted only: (1) if unanimously agreed to by the original Parties; or (2) if carried out in accordance with an Annex hereto, which Annex shall constitute an integral part of this Treaty.

**ARTICLE III**

**Withdrawal**

1. If any Party to this Treaty determines a. that any other Party has not fulfilled its obligations under this Treaty,

b. that nuclear explosions have been conducted by a State not a Party to this Treaty under circumstances which might jeopardize the determining Party's national security, or

c. that nuclear explosions have occurred under circumstances in which it is not possible to identify the State conducting the explosions and that such explosions, if conducted by a Party to this Treaty, would violate the Treaty, or, if not conducted by a Party, might jeopardize the determining Party's national security,

it may submit to the Depositary Government a request for the convening of a conference to which all the Parties to this Treaty shall be invited, and the Depositary Government shall convene such a conference as soon after its receipt of the request as may be practicable. The request for the determining Party to the Depositary Government shall be accompanied by a statement of the evidence on which the determination was based.

2. The conference shall, taking into account the statement of evidence provided by the determining Party and any other relevant information, examine the facts and assess the significance of the situation.

3. After the conclusion of the conference or after the expiration of a period of 60 days from the date of the receipt of the request for the conference by the Depositary Government, whichever is the earlier, any Party to this Treaty may, if it deems withdrawal from the Treaty necessary for its national security, give notice of such withdrawal to the Depositary Government. Such withdrawal shall take effect on the date specified in the notice, which shall in no event be earlier than 60 days from receipt of the notice of the Depositary Government. The

notice shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the reasons for the withdrawal.

**ARTICLE IV**

**Amendments**

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Depositary Government which shall circulate it to all Parties. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Government shall convene a conference, to which it shall invite all Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty or its Annex must be approved by a vote of two-thirds of the Parties, including all of the original Parties. It shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit or ratifications by two-thirds of the Parties to this treaty, including ratification by the original Parties.

**ARTICLE V**

**Signature, ratification, accession, entry into force, and registration**

1. This Treaty shall be open until ----- to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Government of -----, which is hereby designated the Depositary Government.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force on ----- for States which have deposited instruments of ratification or accession on or before that date, provided that the ratifications deposited include those of the Original Parties. If ratifications by all three original Parties are not deposited on or before -----, this Treaty shall enter into force on the date on which ratifications by all of them have been deposited.

4. Instruments of ratification or accession deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty shall become binding on the date of deposit.

5. The Depositary Government shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each ratification and of accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or notices of withdrawals.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Government pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

**ARTICLE VI**

**Authentic texts**

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Government. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Government to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

Done at -----, this ----- day of -----, one thousand nine-hundred and sixty-two.

**TEXT OF TREATY OF AUGUST 7**

Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as the "Original Parties",

Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to

the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances,

Have agreed as follows:

#### ARTICLE I

1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

(a) in the atmosphere; beyond its limits, including outer space; or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or

(b) in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the State under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted. It is understood in this connection that the provisions of this subparagraph are without prejudice to the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground, the conclusion of which, as the Parties have stated in the Preamble to this Treaty, they seek to achieve.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this Article.

#### ARTICLE II

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary Governments which shall circulate it to all Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to this Treaty, including the votes of all of the Original Parties. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all of the Original Parties.

#### ARTICLE III

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the Original Parties—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all the Original Parties and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification

of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

#### ARTICLE IV

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty three months in advance.

#### ARTICLE V

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

DONE in triplicate at the city of Moscow the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

For the Government of the United States of America:

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, hastily drafted or not, a partial test ban treaty is now before the Senate for consideration. We have the responsibility of advising the President to ratify or not to ratify the treaty. This will not be an easy task, for we must weigh several factors, some of them conflicting ones, before reaching a decision. Among them, one is highly technical and exceedingly complex; the other is political and perhaps equally, if differently, complex.

The technical factor relates to the posture of the American second-strike strategic retaliatory forces. The Secretary of Defense, in testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, asserted categorically that our "strategic missile force is designed to survive, and it will survive." He continued:

We know, and the Soviets know, that in the event of a surprise Soviet first strike, at least a substantial proportion of our Minuteman missiles will survive. Also, we and they know that the Polaris submarines at sea and many strategic aircraft will survive. We can say with assurance that, even after such a Soviet strike, the total surviving U.S. strategic nuclear force will be large enough to destroy the enemy.

This is heartening. On the other hand, what about the effects of the detonation of 50- to 100-megaton devices upon the radar network designed to give us sufficient advance warning of a missile attack and upon the command and control systems which are integral components of our strategic retaliatory forces? Could such a detonation by the Soviets over the polar icecap black out our early-warning radar network, thus reducing the alert available to our retaliatory forces? Could a similar explosion over the United States in effect neutralize our missile forces by disrupting their

command and control systems? Although he admits to uncertainties with respect to the effect of high-altitude detonation of supermegaton devices, Secretary McNamara indicates that we can clear them up through theoretical analysis of existing data and extrapolation. Some scientists, however, feel that we simply do not know very much about these matters and that, therefore, testing of supermegaton devices by the United States is necessary to ascertain the effects of their detonation upon the alerting and functioning of our retaliatory missile forces. Their view is reflected by the distinguished and well informed analyst of military affairs, Hanson Baldwin, who wrote in the New York Times on August 15, 2 days after Secretary McNamara's testimony:

The blast, heat, radioactivity, and electromagnetic effect of 50- to 100-megaton explosions could black out radar and communications and could destroy control systems or the missile silos themselves.

The whole matter of the security of our strategic nuclear strike forces and the effects of supermegaton explosions on them disturbs me greatly. As I indicated a few moments ago, it is exceedingly complex and highly technical for the layman like myself. It is more difficult to evaluate when there are conflicting assessments by the experts. Moreover, no American can regard lightly the opinions of such great Americans as Adm. Arleigh Burke, Dr. Edward Teller, and Gen. Thomas S. Power, who have stated courageously why they believe this treaty not to be to the best of American interests.

Another factor we must weigh in considering this treaty is political. We have been advised by some people that in balancing the political factor against the technical one we shall discover that the political advantages to be derived from this treaty outweigh the technical drawbacks, such as the uncertainties I cited earlier.

President Kennedy hailed the treaty in his nationwide speech of July 26 as "an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war." Perhaps he is right. I hope so. Much depends upon the nature of the next steps, however. If they are to be those outlined by Khrushchev on July 2, in East Germany, and on July 19, at a Soviet-Hungarian friendship rally in Moscow, I am genuinely worried. For Khrushchev's proposals, which include a NATO-Warsaw Pact nonaggression agreement and the reduction of military forces on both sides of the line running through the heart of Germany, could, if adopted, weaken the West's position in central Europe and lead to the neutralization of West Germany and the dissolution of the Western alliance, which is the primary objective of the Soviets in Europe. Developments since the initialing of the test ban treaty have calmed my fears somewhat, but I feel that we must be most cautious and prudent in considering the next steps proposed by the Soviets.

We have an idea of Khrushchev's conception of the next steps. But what about President Kennedy's conception?



I have seen little evidence of an American initiative in this area. In fact, we appear to be following Khrushchev's lead, as evidenced by our interest in the nonaggression pact suggestion.

Can we not suggest that the next steps toward peace and reason and away from war be taken in Laos, in Cuba, and in Berlin? It was President Kennedy's initiative, in proposing the Moscow conference, that paved the way for the treaty now before us. Now it is Khrushchev's turn.

At his meeting with President Kennedy in Vienna 2 years ago, Khrushchev solemnly pledged to uphold the independence and neutrality of Laos. This pledge has been termed a litmus-paper test of Soviet intentions by Kennedy administration officials. He has not kept it. Now he can.

Khrushchev pledged last fall to withdraw Soviet forces from Cuba in due course. Although President Kennedy has reported some reduction in their numerical strength, it is clear that this pledge has not been fulfilled. Now Khrushchev can fulfill that pledge.

It was exactly this point that I was driving at upon the floor of the Senate yesterday in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I suggested then that the time for such bargains was before the signing of the treaty; that we have now passed the psychological moment when we can demand a quid pro quo; and that the psychological moment passed when the treaty was signed. It will be much more difficult to get such a quid pro quo from the Communists at a time like this.

I have no doubt that any withdrawal from Cuba pursuant to any inspection will be a long one and reluctant one, something that will not occur unless it is precipitated either by the Cubans themselves or by the Cubans with the support of the United States.

Two years ago, the Communists erected the odious "wall of shame" in Berlin. If they truly desire to take steps toward peace and reason and away from war, they can signify their good intentions by dismantling the wall.

Mr. President, I have discussed some of the factors that I am weighing as I consider the test ban treaty. I am struck by the apparent haste in which it was concluded. I am deeply troubled by the possible gaps in our knowledge concerning the effects of high-altitude supermegaton explosions upon the posture of our retaliatory strategic missile forces. I am concerned about the direction in which this treaty, as a vaguely defined "first step," could lead us. Unfortunately, the factors that must be weighed in our consideration of this treaty are not cut and dried. For this reason, reaching a decision is difficult.

The history of the relations between the United States and Soviet Russia, since our first recognition of that country, is not such as to inspire confidence in either the Russian motivation or the reliability of any agreement made with Russians. In fact, based upon the number of broken treaties and agreements which the Russians have made, we have more reason to be suspect of their intentions

of keeping this treaty than we have to believe that they will respect it. In the field of international relations between countries, we cannot place ourselves upon a plane of high idealism and refuse to look at the motivations of other countries. To do so would be to shirk the fundamental duty of the Senate in the coming week, when it must either approve or refuse to approve the treaty.

What is this motivation? Heretofore, I have suggested some of the things which may be the motivation; yet today, that motivation is not clear to me. I am sure there is a motivation, for the Russians are nothing if they are not realists. Is fear of nuclear war what causes them to sign such a treaty? I doubt it, because they know that the President and the Defense Department and the American people are completely saturated with the concept of defense only, which has prevailed over the years. It is illogical to assume that a country which never has pursued an aggressive or acquisitive policy is going to change that policy overnight and commence such a war, particularly when it knows that it can do so only at the price of a nuclear holocaust. Has the Red Chinese rift caused Russia to do this? No man with commonsense can believe that is true. It is true that the Chinese have the largest population on earth; but in this modern day and age, war can be waged only by a country with a great industrial potential. In this respect, Red China is industrially coming up out of the miocene ooze, compared with Russia's present industrial potential. China cannot and could not wage a major war, and is not likely to be able to do so in the next 10 or 20 years.

Mr. President, our concern is that possibly Russia has achieved a scientific breakthrough which, if known to the President, has not been told to the American people or to Congress itself. If this is true, then—to paraphrase Shakespeare—the treaty might well be the "sleep of death" which must give us pause. Against this eventuality, we have been given assurances by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the President, and many others high in authority. If this be just one more attempt at "gimmick" government, government by press agency, adulation of the Kennedy personality cult, an election elixir, then this will indeed be the sorriest day for America. But we have no right to assume that these men do not act in good faith, or that they have withheld material facts from the people or the Congress. In fact, they have given us every assurance that they have not done so.

Despite the solemn warnings of the President and all others involved in drafting this treaty, the immediate reaction, as exhibited by my own mail and by the mail of most of the Members of Congress, is that the treaty will result in a nuclear utopia, that the specter of nuclear war is gone, and that world disarmament is around the corner. The reaction shown by most of the nations in the world, particularly those in southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America, has been substantially the same. Last year,

as a congressional delegate for the United States to the United Nations, I learned of the great concern which the representatives of these countries had about the nuclear race. In some cases, the concern was almost hysterical. As a result, Mr. President, today we find that even before the treaty was reported by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, 86 nations had scampered like wildlife before a forest fire to place their names on the treaty.

I must pay tribute particularly to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who so promptly held full committee hearings upon this matter.

Not to approve the treaty, therefore, would be to douse all the hopes of those nations—illogical though their hopes may be, in light of the treaty itself—and to say to them—figuratively, not literally—that we are not interested in the cessation of nuclear tests or in stopping the saturation of the earth's atmosphere with radioactive fallout. It seems to me this is a price we can ill afford to pay, if we are to retain the confidence of the world in our moral leadership. No one should ever have written a treaty which permitted such a stampede, before the United States had an opportunity to consider, on the merits of the treaty itself, rather than on the merits of international press agency, the treaty as an effective basis for the control of nuclear tests.

But we are called upon to make a decision, Mr. President; and decision means choice. While I feel, to a degree at least, that this Nation has been blackjacked into approval of this treaty, failure to approve it could destroy our already fast-diminishing claim to the moral leadership of the world. The Berlin wall, the two Cuban escapades, Laos, and now South Vietnam, have tarnished our claim to that leadership; and I believe we cannot now do otherwise than approve this treaty. If, based upon a preponderance of evidence which would sway intelligent and reasonable minds, there were a clear-cut reason why we should not approve it, then—even though we would thus dash the hopes of every other nation on earth—I would not vote to approve the treaty. But in the absence of such a preponderance of evidence, I shall reluctantly vote in favor of approval of the treaty, unless facts which may appear subsequently supply a weight of evidence which clearly shows the treaty to be contrary to our national safety.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, provided it is understood that in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st session, the nuclear test ban treaty, which had been reported favorably by Mr. FULBRIGHT from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which was read the second time, as follows:

**TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, IN OUTER SPACE AND UNDER WATER.**

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as the "Original Parties",

Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances,

Have agreed as follows:

**ARTICLE I**

1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

(a) in the atmosphere; beyond its limits, including outer space; or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or

(b) in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the State under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted. It is understood in this connection that the provisions of this subparagraph are without prejudice to the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground, the conclusion of which, as the Parties have stated in the Preamble to this Treaty, they seek to achieve.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this Article.

**ARTICLE II**

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary Governments which shall circulate it to all Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to this Treaty, including the votes of all of the Original Parties. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all of the Original Parties.

**ARTICLE III**

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not

sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the Original Parties—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all the Original Parties and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification or accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

**ARTICLE IV**

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty three months in advance.

**ARTICLE V**

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

DONE in triplicate at the city of Moscow the fifth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

For the Government of the United States of America:

DEAN RUSK

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

HOME

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

A. GROMYKO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the treaty will be the pending business when the Senate convenes on Monday.

**ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. MORSE. I have been glad to yield.

**INTERIM REPORT ON MILITARY AND TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY**

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, has been conducting extensive and exhaustive hearings on nuclear test ban matters since September 1962. During recent weeks the hearings have focused upon the military and technical implications of the pending treaty which would bar nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space, and under water. An earnest, determined, and conscientious effort has been made to develop all of the facts from qualified military and scientific people, and to arrive at solid answers to the many complex, troublesome, and difficult questions which are involved.

During the past week, I have received numerous inquiries as to the status of our hearings, with particular emphasis upon the question of whether the subcommittee proposes to issue a report and, if so, when. Another subject of inquiry has been the matter of the printing and public release of the transcripts of the hearings. I believe it is proper and fitting for me to advise the Senate and the public of the status of these matters.

The subcommittee plans to issue an interim report dealing specifically with the military and technical implications of the partial test ban and the impact which the treaty, if approved, would have upon our present and future military striking power. This report is now in the process of preparation, and it is hoped that it will be available for release early next week.

With respect to the printing of the transcripts, let me point out that the sensitive matters involved in our hearings made it mandatory that the testimony be received in executive session. We have made every effort to abide by all applicable security requirements and regulations. Therefore, before the testimony can be printed, it is necessary that the typewritten transcripts be gone over thoroughly in order to delete therefrom all sensitive information which, if made public, might be of value to a potential enemy. Subject only to this, we will make the testimony public to the greatest extent possible.

We are today releasing the testimony of General Power, which has been cleared for security.

Although the subcommittee staff has been working diligently to get the transcripts ready for printing, the magnitude of the problem now makes it clear it will be impossible to print them prior to the conclusion of the debate upon the test ban treaty. However, copies of the transcripts, in their classified form, are available in the office of the subcommittee and can be there examined by any Senator upon request.

Mr. President, a great deal of effort has been made to get those records cleared for security in time to be printed,



but it is quite a long process, even after we get the transcript back with the deletions, to put it in shape to go to the printer.

I would now like to make a few remarks about the proposed nuclear test ban as an individual Senator. I preface these remarks with the statement that on these points I speak only for myself.

On May 28, 1963, I took the floor of the Senate and addressed myself to Senate Resolution 148 which had then just been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] and others. As will be recalled, this resolution proposed that the Senate go on record as supporting a renewed offer by the United States to the Soviet Union of an agreement banning all tests that contaminate the atmosphere or the ocean and, in the event of the rejection of such offer, that we commit ourselves unilaterally to a moratorium on such testing.

I then pointed out that the question of banning nuclear testing in the atmosphere involves serious security considerations and was intimately related to the problem of national survival.

Some of the questions which I then said must be asked and answered before the necessary assurance could be acquired were:

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to provide our Nation with an effective defense against Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles?

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to provide our Nation with a certain capability of penetrating a Soviet missile defense employing nuclear warheads?

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to assure the survival of our offensive missile systems after a surprise enemy nuclear attack?

Since my floor statement of May 28, 1963, these and other questions have been explored in depth and detail by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. We have had before us many of the most knowledgeable people in the country upon the military and technical aspects of the problem. The information which we have obtained has not been reassuring to me. On the contrary, the evidence before the subcommittee has given me, as an individual Senator, cause for great concern and alarm about the security implications of the proposed treaty.

In short, based upon a long and serious study and assessment of the testimony which has been presented to us—and I did not make any conclusion on that point until all of the testimony was in just a few days ago—I have come to the conclusion that the net military disadvantages to the United States which are inherent in the proposed treaty are so serious and formidable as to raise very serious questions as to the effect of the treaty upon our national security, safety and survival. Considering the treaty comprehensively I have found nothing in it which counterbalances this factor to the extent that I can say that the military risks which are inherent in the treaty are, on balance, acceptable. In fact, the contrary is true.

My concern in this matter is to do all that I can to insure that our vital interests are protected and that our capacity to defend ourselves against an aggressor is not degraded. Since I have reached the conclusion that unacceptable military and security risks are involved in the proposed treaty and that it is not in the national self-interest, I shall have no alternative but to cast my vote against its ratification. At a later date I shall discuss in detail the reasons and facts which have impelled me to take this stand.

I thank the Senator from Oregon again for his courtesy.

Mr. MORSE. It is my pleasure to cooperate with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

#### THE STOCKPILE INQUIRY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have before me an article which appeared in the press with respect to some remarks apparently written by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. I have not seen what he said, but I have the article in my hand. Based upon that newspaper article, I desire to make a statement this afternoon with respect to the subject the Senator from New Jersey brought up.

A newspaper story today states that the Senator from New Jersey said in connection with the pending report on the stockpile that I had refused "to let the men accused in the report submit their defense with the release of the findings."

The Senator from New Jersey did request that the proposed report of the subcommittee be first submitted to those witnesses to whom he wanted to show it; but I found, to the best of my knowledge, that any such action would be without precedent; and I also felt that it would be improper to submit a subcommittee report of this character to any of the witnesses before it had been submitted to the full Armed Services Committee.

The Senator from New Jersey states that the report was "more the work of Timothy J. May, assistant counsel."

That is not correct. Mr. May did work on the report, as did many others, but every word of said report was first approved by the chief counsel of the subcommittee, Mr. R. C. Coburn, prior to its submission to me and my subsequent submission to the subcommittee.

The Senator from New Jersey is quoted as asserting Mr. May was formerly a member of the White House staff.

Mr. President, I do not see why that is particularly pertinent especially if Mr. May possessed information or experience which would help the chief counsel and the subcommittee get the facts; but in any case it is also an incorrect statement.

Mr. May was not a member of the White House staff at the time he was employed by the counsel of the subcommittee, and had never been a member of the White House staff. He had been a

consultant to the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. Since that office supervised stockpile policy, it was logical for Mr. Coburn to want his services.

When the report was originally submitted, some members thought it was too long.

Investigating these contracts was a very complicated accounting effort. It was understandable that after a year's hearings, a long report could be in order; but in any case, in an effort to accommodate those on the subcommittee who felt it was too long, it is now being reworked by counsel in the hope it will be satisfactory to the subcommittee.

The Senator from New Jersey is reported as stating that the inquiry was "limited to a partial examination of the handling of a few metals during the period of the previous administration."

That also is not correct.

Many contracts investigated were signed in both previous administrations, and also in the current administration, in many cases either after critical published reports or investigation by the General Accounting Office; and every contract was investigated that was requested by any member of the subcommittee or Member of the Senate.

The Senator is reported as saying that he is "not interested in covering up or accusing anyone." I am glad to know that.

Perhaps the reason for much of the above is the fact that the Senator from New Jersey was not appointed to the subcommittee until March 26, 1963, many weeks after the hearings were completed; and therefore the Senator from New Jersey did not participate, at any time, in any of the hearings.

The report is based on the record of the hearings. The Senate and the people are entitled to a summary of the findings. That is the duty of the subcommittee and I intend to see that that duty is carried out.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my able friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. There is one thing about the statement made by the Senator from Missouri this afternoon which disturbs the senior Senator from Oregon, if it is correctly understood. The Senator said, I believe, that the committee is now at work cutting down the length of the report. I hope this does not mean that the Senate will be denied any information it should have in regard to this investigation, because in my judgment the Senate is entitled to all the information.

I have not participated in any way in the discussion of this investigation over the many months during which it has been going on.

The Senator from Missouri knows that there is an operation in the State of Oregon involving a nickel mine and plant which, in newspaper stories, at least, has been involved in the investigation to various degrees. I have received many inquiries about it. My answer has been uniform. I propose to wait until all the record is in and the committee has completed its hearings and made its full report.

I sincerely hope the chairman of the committee is not in a position in which, for any reason whatsoever, he has to delete from the report information which, in his original judgment, the Senate is entitled to receive.

As one Senator who has the kind of interest in the matter I have outlined, I wish to be sure that I have all the information, so that when I reach my evaluation of the report and reply to my constituents I shall know I have a full record.

I am also aware—and I have a little sense of humor about this—that there is always a desire in the Senate to be brief, but I have observed after 19 years here that sometimes the desire to be brief is motivated by the desire to cover up. I would much prefer to speak at length and to write at length, satisfied that by so doing I was making a complete record.

I hope that we shall not get such a brevity-stricken report that we shall not be able to present to our constituents all the information we should be able to present in our final evaluation of the Senator's work.

I wish to say something about the Senator's work, based upon my great respect for and unlimited confidence in him. As the Senator knows, although I have not in any way participated in the conferences in regard to this investigation, from the very beginning I have had complete confidence in the integrity and the dedicated public service purpose of the Senator from Missouri in conducting the investigation. So far as I am concerned, as is true of all such matters, the issue is nonpartisan when we are dealing with the public interest. It makes no difference to me, when alleged irregularities arise in an administration of this Government, whether it be under a Democratic or Republican administration. The senior Senator from Oregon has always insisted, and will continue to insist, that there be the most thorough investigation in the public interest.

I have been confident that the Senator from Missouri has been conducting such an investigation. I wished to make this statement before I asked the Senator for a reply with respect to two questions.

First, can the Senator give me assurance that he is not so cutting down the report that I, along with other Senators, will thereby be denied information to which all Senators are entitled?

Second, is it not true that all of the witnesses who may be involved in any charges or criticism in the report—which I have not seen—testified or had the opportunity to make whatever statements they wished to make in their own defense?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his considerate remarks with respect to efforts made in this regard. The Senator from Oregon is not only a great Senator, but also an articulate former dean of a law school. Therefore, when he emphasizes the importance of making a complete record

he does it from a background equaled by few if any Members of this body.

The hearings were quite long. Because the records prior to these hearings had always been classified so the information was kept from the American people, and because there was so much money involved—specifically some \$9 billion—the work could not have been done without extensive accounting research. I am glad to report to the able Senator from Oregon, and to the Senate that we had the fullest cooperation from the Comptroller General of the United States, an Eisenhower appointee, and his staff. Because of the tremendous amount of detail involved, the hearings would not have been possible without such cooperation.

The record of the hearings goes to some 4,000 pages. Any report, along with suggested legislation can only be of value when it truly portrays the various conditions and facts with regard to the various contracts in question; therefore, the report was relatively long.

I have not had the type and character of experience which the able Senator from Oregon has had, so I left it up to the subcommittee's chief counsel, one of the most able and prominent lawyers in this country, saying to him, "See if you can reduce the size of the report without affecting the record of the presentation to the Senate." He said, "I will do my best to that end," and that is what is going on at the present time.

In reply to the second question of the Senator from Oregon, there was no witness before the subcommittee who did not have an opportunity to testify completely with respect to a contract in question. All the witnesses testified under oath. Because there were discrepancies in the sworn testimony of members of the General Accounting Office team, the General Services Administration representatives before the committee from the Office of Emergency Planning and representatives of certain companies, it was necessary that further work be done in an effort to get the facts.

I again thank my colleague from Oregon for his kind remarks about my approach to this problem, and I would reciprocate with respect to any problem he presented to the Senate. I assure him that I have taken on this obligation as a Senator from Missouri, to give to the Senate the facts based on the record we have compiled.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that his replies to my questions satisfy me, and if after reading the record I feel it is desirable for me to check the records of the committee, it is my understanding that any Member of the Senate has access to those records, subject to the same rules of restriction that are imposed upon members of the subcommittee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Oregon is correct. The hearings themselves are now printed and a matter of record. We are working on legislation, because we want to have a constructive report, and I am sure there is not a member of the subcommittee but who agrees there should be some improvements in

the legislation. We hope to present both a report and legislation to the Senate at an early time.

#### APPOINTMENT OF PUBLIC MEMBERS OF RAILROAD ARBITRATION BOARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I turn to the two subject matters I rise to speak about, I want to extend to the President of the United States my enthusiastic compliments and sincere congratulations for the appointment of very able public members of the arbitration board to arbitrate the two main issues in the pending railroad dispute that were referred to the board by congressional legislation.

The chairman of the board is Mr. Ralph T. Seward, a very able lawyer and an arbitrator of great distinction in the field of labor arbitration in the United States.

When I was a member of the War Labor Board, he was one of our top counsel. We assigned him many times to the arbitration of cases during the war, and in each case he performed outstanding service. After I left the Board to run for the Senate, he for a time, as I recall, was a member of the Board.

Another member of the board, Prof. James J. Healy, of Harvard University, was one of my associates on the special commission appointed by President Kennedy earlier this year to try to settle the dock strike, which had the east coast and the gulf coast tied up tighter than a drum. Professor Healy is undoubtedly one of the two or three top authorities in this country on the economic problems involved in labor relation contracts, particularly in respect to welfare funds, pensions, health benefit funds, and job security problems.

I had an opportunity to work day and night with Professor Healy during the time we sought to settle the dock strike. As I said earlier this year, about him and the other member of that special panel, Ted Kheel, of New York, I could not have had assigned to me two more able colleagues. I am delighted to know President Kennedy has appointed Professor Healy as one of the arbitration board members.

The third member of the board is Benjamin Aaron, who was one of the top members of the War Labor Board when I served on it, and also one of our most distinguished arbitrators. I am delighted to know he has been given this opportunity for further dedicated public service.

To the carriers and the brotherhoods, I say the President has given you three judicious, impartial men to consider the evidence on its merits, and you have every right to have complete confidence in the public members that the President has assigned to the board.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a story appearing in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Seward Given Chairmanship of Rail Panel," in which the qualifications not only of Mr. Seward but of Professor Healy and Mr. Aaron are set out, be printed at this point in the Record.



There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**SEWARD GIVEN CHAIRMANSHIP OF RAIL PANEL**  
(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Kennedy yesterday named Ralph T. Seward, a Washington, D.C., labor mediator, as chairman of the seven-man board to arbitrate the railroad work rules dispute.

The President also named the two other public members of the board. They are James J. Healy, professor of industrial relations at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and Benjamin Aaron, director of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California.

All three have had long experience as labor arbitrators. They will have the real power on the seven-man board, which is empowered to decide the two main issues in the railroad controversy: concerning the jobs of locomotive firemen and the composition of train crews.

The labor and management representatives on the panel were unable to agree on the three public members, and the President therefore named them in accordance with emergency legislation passed by Congress August 28.

Labor members are H. E. Gilbert, president of the Firemen's Union, and Roy McDonald, vice president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Management members are J. E. Wolfe, chairman of the railroad negotiating committee, and Guy Knight, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The joint congressional resolution creating the board and providing for binding arbitration directs the board to begin work within 30 days and to hand down its decision not later than 90 days thereafter.

In announcing selection of the public members, White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said the board may begin its work Friday at the Labor Department.

Seward is impartial umpire of the Bethlehem Steel-United Steelworkers contract and has served in a similar capacity for a number of other major contracts. He was a public member of the War Labor Board for a brief period in World War II.

Healy has been arbitrator of a number of labor cases and has served on Taft-Hartley boards of inquiry. Aaron is a past president of the National Academy of Arbitrators and was a member of the War Labor Board from 1942 to 1945.

**GOVERNOR WALLACE, OF ALABAMA**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next topic I wish to discuss briefly deals with the statement I made yesterday in regard to the psychoneurotic tendencies of the Governor of Alabama, Mr. Wallace.

Mr. President, in the intervening hours I have been "bombarded" by the press, seeking to obtain from me the source of the information about the psychoneurotic tendencies of the Governor of Alabama which I set forth in the RECORD yesterday.

The interesting thing is that the press has not been inclined to question the accuracy of my statement, but was persistent—that is a mild word to use in connection with the position taken by some members of the press—in their attempted interviews with me and in some of their representations to the members of my office staff, for they seem to be asking that they could not obtain from my office the information which they sought.

Mr. President, members of the great journalistic profession have taken great

pride in standing behind what they consider to be one of the cardinal principles of their code of journalistic ethics—that no newspaperman will betray a confidence as to the source of his information. I am a little surprised that members of the press think that such a code should not be followed by politicians, but I want to say to all of them now, from the floor of the Senate this afternoon, that I do not violate my code of political ethics, either.

They have every right and duty to ask their questions, but they must expect others to observe their own rights and duties, too.

The information I put in the RECORD yesterday about the psychoneurotic tendencies of the Governor of Alabama is accurate information, and it will speak for itself. But then, says the press, "Didn't you violate some confidence?" The answer is "No." However, I will come to grips with what these questions of the press really mean and imply. I point out that there is no veterans' preference right in the United States to destroy the constitutional guarantees of Negroes in Alabama or anywhere else in this country.

It was not pleasant to make the speech of yesterday, but I stand on every word of it. In carrying out my trust in the Senate, I have the controlling objective at all times of putting the public interest first. When any personal interest interferes with that public interest, the Senator from Oregon can always be counted upon to stand up for the public interest.

The time had come to disclose to America the great danger to this Republic represented by the Governor of Alabama. The Governor of Alabama challenges government by law. When government by law is shaken in this country, the Republic is threatened. The Governor of Alabama challenges the preservation of the Union. When the preservation of the Union is challenged, our freedoms are threatened. The course of conduct of the Governor of Alabama is a course of conduct which incites and encourages riots and the shedding of blood. It is an ugly fact and a sad fact, but already his hands are dripping with blood.

It is my position that when any Governor, when any individual, when any group, or force in this country follows a course of action which threatens the preservation of the Union, which threatens government by law, which incites riots, which encourages mob action which leads to bloodshed, it is the duty of men who have taken the oath in high office in this country to sustain and protect the Constitution of this country, to stand up and be counted and to speak out in defense of the Nation, and its principles. That has been the position of the senior Senator from Oregon.

If there are those followers of the Governor of Alabama, who wish to draw the issue of whether we are going to maintain a system of government by law and enforce the decisions of our courts, on which depends the preservation of the liberties and freedoms of every American, then the Government of the United States must meet that challenge with whatever force is neces-

sary to preserve the Constitution and to continue and maintain a system of government by law.

So long as the Governor of Alabama follows what I consider to be a highly abnormal course of action, indicative, in my judgment, of a high state of nervous tension, which psychiatrists call a psychoneurosis, it is the duty of this Government to apply whatever checks are necessary to stop his course of action in order to preserve our system of government by law.

**FOREIGN AID, GERMAN REPARATIONS, AND THE ISRAEL ECONOMY**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I have been speaking almost daily in opposition to many parts of the pending foreign aid bill. I have a few additional remarks to make on that subject now.

Every time we hear a spokesman for the foreign aid program defend the pending authorization bill, we usually hear reference to two or three specific countries that are cited as successes of U.S. aid.

One of them is Israel. We know that Israel has, for the last 10 years, received very large amounts of economic aid. We also know that its economy is doing well and its aid is currently being reduced.

But this does not mean that Israel should be considered typical of underdeveloped nations, or that our aid program can produce the results elsewhere that have occurred in Israel.

For one thing, Israel has a very small population. Coupled with our large aid program, this has resulted in a high per capita application of capital. In fiscal 1962, for example, our aid to Israel ran at the rate of \$35.83 per person.

Certainly any aid program of that intensity is going to produce results. But when we get to countries with populations of 20, 30, 50, and 100 million and more, aid of that magnitude is not possible.

There is another factor that makes Israel the exception rather than the rule. This is the large part that German reparations have played in its economic growth. I am sure that very few Americans know that West Germany has contributed to Israel in reparations about as much as the United States has extended to her in foreign aid.

An article by William Mehlmán in the current issue of the Reporter magazine, brings out the important role these reparations have played in Israel's economic progress. Mr. Mehlmán points out that the \$825 million in reparations carried the burden of Israel's industrial development, while aid from other sources was applied to the peripheral problems of reclamation, road building, health services, debt refinancing, and imports of consumer goods.

I might add that few Americans are aware that Germany has been carrying this burden, because it seldom shows up in the reports of the defense or foreign aid expenditures of our European allies.

He points out also that most of the \$615 million in personal indemnification paid by the German Government to

victims of the Nazi crimes against the Jews has gone to residents of Israel.

I, for one, am thankful that Israel has accomplished such a high level of progress. Her continuing growth and prosperity will be welcomed by freedom-loving people everywhere, and will continue to contribute to the growth of democracy in the Middle East.

But we will make a grave mistake if we think that because Israel did well and because Israel received U.S. aid, our aid can produce the same results everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent to have the complete text of Mr. Mehlman's article printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### GERMAN REPARATIONS AND THE ISRAELI ECONOMY

(By William Mehlman)

TEL AVIV.—Eleven years have passed since the Israel Parliament, the Knesset, voted adoption of the German Reparations Agreement, amid an atmosphere of street riots and protestations that the government was bartering the sacred memory of 6 million European Jews. It is 10 years since the first installment of the \$825 million in German goods that were to flow into Israel arrived at Haifa port. The agreement that was to run 14 years is ending its course almost 4 years ahead of schedule. Though the offices of the Shilumim Corp., the Israel Reparations Mission to Germany, will formally remain open until 1965, more than 90 percent of the goods ordered under the agreement have been delivered and the rest are already committed (mainly to fuel purchases), with interim financing arranged by Israel until final payment is received.

The remaining opposition to the principle if not the fact of reparations emanates mainly from the Herut Party, the political embodiment of the old underground groups to whom all things German are anathema. But even outside Herut, the question of whether acceptance of German tractors can be construed as payment or forgiveness for Nazi outrages against European Jewry is troubling in a nation one-fourth of whose citizens must live out their lives with personal memories of the camps and crematoria and the families they left on the ash heaps of the 1,000-year Reich. That such memories have not prevented 100,000 Israelis from claiming more than \$600 million in personal reparations from Germany, covering everything from stolen property to interrupted educations, does not alter the fact that many thousands more would sooner starve than accept a German pfennig.

The economic arguments against reparations have lost their validity. The fears in 1952 that the Germans would treat the agreement as "a scrap of paper" once a few token payments had been made, that they would use it to foist inferior goods on Israel at exorbitant prices, that acceptance of German equipment would leave Israel helplessly dependent on Germany for services and spare parts, have all proved groundless. The Germans paid up in record time, most of the goods received were of first quality at market or below-market prices, and the agreement, far from reducing Israel to an economic vassal of Germany, opened a trade route, now running at \$89.3 million a year, that has made Germany Israel's third largest customer. One reservation to the agreement that seemed plausible in 1952—that a shattered Germany could never make good on an \$825 million obligation—proved to be the biggest bubble of them all.

More serious than any of the imagined difficulties in expediting the reparations pay-

ments was the problem of setting down the terms of the agreement itself. The Germans, looking toward the revitalization of their industrial plant, insisted that Germany be the sole source of all goods purchased under the pact. It was only the persistent diplomatic prodding of Dr. F. E. Shinnar, head of the Israel mission, that ultimately persuaded them to permit a special sterling account for the purchase of oil from British firms.

A second conflict arose over the categories of goods that would be made available under the agreement. The German Government was under pressure from German industrial interests to define the payments within a narrow range of plant and other capital equipment. Israel sought a broader definition that would include semifinished goods, building materials, and some consumer items as well as plant equipment. The agreement finally drawn up was the flexible one Israel desired, and here again credit must be given to the diplomatic efforts of Dr. Shinnar. It stipulated five main categories of reparations purchases: capital equipment, including ships and industrial machinery, 57 percent; ferrous and nonferrous metals, including materials for the manufacture of pipes, 18 percent; raw materials including semifinished goods, 15 percent; agricultural products, 4 percent; and services, including shipping, insurance, and administration, 6 percent.

#### THE BENEFITS

One of the effects of reparations was the flexibility they gave the Israel Government in the allocation of other funds received during the payments period. Over the reparations span, Israel sold some \$600 million in independence and development bonds and received more than \$700 million in transfers from such purely charitable sources as the United Jewish Appeal, United Israel Appeal, Hadassah, and Histadrut, to name a few. In addition to these unilateral payments, since 1954 the Government has received, in currency exchange, the bulk of \$615 million in personal indemnification paid to private Israel citizens by Germany for loss of life, liberty, health, property, education, and pension benefits as a result of the activities of the Nazi regime. This money, presently flowing into private bank accounts at the rate of \$135 million annually, is expected to surpass within the next 4 years the total payments made under State reparations. While indemnification payments have added to Israel's current inflationary problems, they have also contributed substantially to the country's foreign-currency reserves.

With reparations assuming the burden of industrial development, the Government was free to concentrate those outside funds on problems that would otherwise have received only divided attention at best. These included absorption of a million new immigrants (half of them from underdeveloped countries), reclamation of the Negev, inauguration of a national roadbuilding program culminating in the Beersheba-Eilat highway, expansion and modernization of hospitals and medical facilities, refinancing of the national debt, and the purchase of heavy quantities of food and other consumer items. Coming at a time when the country was under the severest pressure, the reparations enabled the Government to concentrate its efforts on precisely those areas not covered by the agreement and thus indirectly accelerated the pace of Israel's overall development during the 10-year period during which they were in force.

The complete record of reparations payments and how they were employed would make impressive reading if only for its size and variety. The highlights, as they apply to nine major economic areas, give a fair indication of the total picture:

Industry: New or replacement machinery supplied to 1,275 plants presently employing more than 200,000 workers.

Shipping: Forty-nine ships built and delivered, including bulk carriers, tankers, mixed cargo vessels, and two passenger liners, for a total tonnage of 466,000 tons, opening markets in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. More than 50 percent of reparations goods were carried in ships flying the Israeli flag.

Port facilities: Modernization and enlargement of Haifa port to more than twice its former capacity. Equipment received included a \$2 million floating dock (capacity 7,500 tons) to handle ship repairs, a drydock capable of raising 18,000 tons, a 25-ton-capacity floating crane, 14 rail-operated mobile cranes, a 200-ton-capacity dredger, and building materials to launch the Israel Shipyards on the River Kishon.

Transportation: \$11.5 million in new railway equipment, including automatic signaling devices making express trains possible for the first time in Israel, 12 passenger car sets, 400 freight cars for hauling potash and phosphates from the Negev, rails for the new line to Beersheba and for the replacement of the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem line. Modern aviation equipment was also supplied for the air terminal at Lydda.

Communications: More than \$6 million in telecommunications equipment, including automatic exchanges for all major cities, a radiotelephone hookup to remote settlements, and a ring of Telex stations for Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa, and Beersheba.

Power: Turbogenerators totaling 560,000 kilowatts, a 110-kilovolt high-tension station, power-correcting generators, transformers, and cables. The electric energy supply in Israel since 1953 has increased from 885 million kilowatt-hours to 2 billion kilowatt-hours.

Mining: \$3.5 million in equipment for the Timna Copper Works, currently treating 500,000 tons of copper ore annually.

Housing: \$80 million in construction materials, used in wiping out the "hut cities" of the early 1950's and replacing them with permanent homes for almost a million new immigrants.

Fuel: 9 million tons of oil purchased in England under a special sterling account set up by the West German Government.

#### TWO NATIONS ON TRIAL

Dr. Shinnar, the bespectacled former managing director of the newspaper Ha'aretz, who expedited the scheduling and placement of reparations orders as head of the Israel Mission in Cologne for 10 years, views the experience as a kind of international morality play. "We are both on trial," he said; "the Germans to show how well they could live up to the agreement, the Israelis to show how wisely they could use the funds at their disposal." Shinnar, who held the rank of ambassador plenipotentiary during his residence in Germany, relates that following the signing of the pact in 1952, the Israel Government was besieged with offers of help from international industrial and economic experts and dire warnings from all quarters not to attempt to carry out the agreement with local talent alone. The aid was politely refused and the warnings duly noted, and an all-Israel team took up residence in Cologne to tackle the \$825 million reparations problem.

Whether Israel would have fared any better with the international experts is a question that misses the central point of the whole reparations story, as far as Shinnar is concerned. "The point," he said, "is that we had to show the Germans we could do it on our own and do it well. We had to eradicate the old stereotype of the Jew as a shopkeeper and peddler and replace it with the image of a new breed of Jew, politically independent and capable of building an economically workable state."

Considering the enormity of the task they faced, it is generally agreed that Shinnar and his group did a remarkable job. Cer-



tainly the mission ran a tight ship, holding administrative costs to 0.75 percent of the total while maintaining a staff that at one time numbered as many as 300. But some costly mistakes were made. The Israel Steel Works in Acre, built on the assumption that Israel could produce commercially acceptable steel from native ore, swallowed up \$30 million in reparations. The ore may have been adequate in King Solomon's time but it falls somewhat short of 20th century standards, and steel production at Acre based on imported ore and fuel has been costing Israel \$250 a ton—two to three times the price at which it can be bought on the world market.

The Government has attempted to rationalize the steelmaking venture as a standby defense installation to be used in the event of a war or an embargo on strategic materials. But a steel mill that must depend on imported raw materials to operate can be of little help against an embargo. Israel could have stockpiled a formidable supply of finished steel with the money it has cost to build and operate the Acre plant.

The end of reparations will unquestionably be felt, especially in the industrial sector, but it will not be a body blow to Israel's economy. The country is now too far advanced to be crippled by any single factor. Besides, the momentum of industrial development that German payments helped establish is now being carried forward at an accelerated pace by foreign investment. In the past 3 years alone, more than \$435 million has poured into Israel in the form of Government-approved overseas investment. One of the major attractions the country has held for investors is its 1959 revised law for the encouragement of capital investments. Among other advantages, it allows overseas firms full repatriation of their profits in their own currency, a double depreciation allowance on their equipment, duty-free importation of raw materials, a 28-percent ceiling on corporate income taxes for the first 5 years of profitable operation, and Government loans of up to 50 percent on total capital outlay. This encouragement has been responsible for the entry of such companies as Studebaker, the Chemstrand Division of Monsanto International, E. W. Bliss, Leyland Motors of England, General Tire & Rubber, Miles Chemicals, Revlon, Fairbanks-Whitney, North American Rayon, Deere & Co., and Dayton Rubber.

This march of foreign firms into Israel has been notable for their willingness to ignore the Arab boycott, once a formidable deterrent to relations of any kind with Israel. The reasons are mainly economic. Aside from the incentives offered, overseas companies have found that Israel, with its per capita income of \$700 a year, is a better market for their goods than the Arab countries, despite the vast disparity in population. Moreover, they have discovered that the Arabs eventually get around to buying what they need anyway.

Where Arab pressure has been attempted, overseas firms have stood up to it and managed to survive. Conrad Hilton recently informed the Egyptian Government that it could buy up his interests in the Cairo Hilton anytime it saw fit but that he was going ahead with the construction of his new hotel in Tel Aviv. The Cairo hotel has been the weak sister of the Hilton international family since its inception. Hilton expects to make money in Israel. No one, apparently, wants to repeat the mistake of Renault, which closed an active assembly plant in Israel in quest of the "larger" Arab market. Last year Renault sold a grand total of eight cars in Egypt. Studebaker, which moved in to fill the vacuum left by Renault's departure, is doing a profitable business among the less numerous but more affluent Israelis.

This injection of large doses of foreign investment capital has not yet enabled Israel

to overcome a \$400 million annual trade deficit, the inflationary effects of a recent currency devaluation, or its difficulties in finding common ground with its biggest customer, the Common Market. It has, however, added to a foreign currency reserve that now totals more than \$600 million, which should enable the country to handle the payments now coming due on its independence and development bond issues. During 1963, the Government will redeem \$24.5 million in independence bonds. Redemptions for 1964 are projected at \$44.8 million. Current sales of more than \$60 million a year in new development bonds should more than cover future payouts. Moreover, if the bondholders continue the present trend of cashing their bonds in Israel pounds for use on trips to Israel and to convert their matured bonds into Israel common stock and renewal bonds, future hard-currency outlays may be even smaller than anticipated.

#### THE COMMON MARKET QUESTION

Israel's big economic problem is its relations with the Common Market. The Six and the United Kingdom together absorb 43 percent of the country's exports, while supplying 45 percent of the products it buys. Any hope of reducing the current trade deficit from \$400 to \$250 million, as envisioned in the country's new 4-year economic program announced in February 1962, will depend upon Israel's ability to increase exports to Europe by 150 percent between now and 1966. The prospects for such an increase are not favorable. Three rounds of negotiations in Brussels aimed at agreement on a free-trade list of 150 export items essential to Israel have produced exactly three items—bathing suits, potash, and grapefruit. A Dutch plan that would have permitted a 25-percent tariff reduction on Israel goods exported to Europe in volume exceeding \$250,000 annually, or \$100,000 where the volume represented more than 50 percent of the total export of any single item, has been quietly shelved.

Israel is in no position to hurdle the 20-percent tariff barrier it will have to face by 1970 unless some arrangement is reached with Europe, nor can it hope to replace its European markets with expanded trade in North and South America, Asia, and Africa. "There is no question of replacement of markets involved here," according to Israel Gal-Edd, deputy director general of the ministry of commerce and industry and permanent member of Israel's negotiating team in Brussels. "Even if our difficulties with Europe were solved tomorrow, we would still have to triple our exports to every single one of these other markets in order to achieve our economic objectives."

These are the problems that will test Israel's skills, diplomatic and economic, in the months and years ahead. The reparations payments that saw the nation through the most critical decade of its independence are now part of Israel's past, as some day all such unilateral payments may be. Their termination has brought the country one step closer to the time when it must stand or fall on its own resources. But by being available when they were needed most, these unique voluntary payments by Germans in token expiation of an essentially incalculable debt may well have provided Israel with part of the economic strength it will need to cope with the demands of the future.

**Mr. MORSE.** Mr. President, the administrators of the foreign aid program do not make a case for themselves on the alleged success of foreign aid by citing Israel, because the other factors which I have mentioned explain in no small measure the reasons for the success of the economic recovery in Israel.

This morning in the Foreign Relations Committee we passed upon a very able

and sound nomination of the President of the United States, that of Mr. Byroade, as the new Ambassador to Burma. As an ambassador he is bound to carry out the instructions and the policies of the administration. Therefore, when I asked the nominee in the hearing this morning whether it was his position that we should continue the foreign aid that we have been giving to Burma, I knew that I would receive an answer supporting the continuation of that foreign aid.

Obviously, that is his ambassadorial duty, so long as that is the policy of the administration. But I asked the question in order to point out—as I now point out from my desk in the Senate to the American people—that in continuing foreign aid to Burma, we continue to support a military dictatorship and we are supporting a good many military dictatorships in many parts of the world. The senior Senator from Oregon is opposed to supporting any military dictatorship anywhere in the world, including Burma.

I pointed out in my examination of the nominee for the ambassadorship to Burma—and a good nomination it is; I was pleased subsequently to vote for it and for a favorable report of it to the Senate—that the military dictator of Burma keeps in jail the former democratic leader of Burma, Mr. U Nu. Mr. U Nu is known by most of the Members of the Senate. He has been in Washington on several occasions. On one occasion, Mr. U Nu appeared at an informal meeting with many of us in the Committee on Foreign Relations. We met with him, as we do with many other distinguished officials from foreign governments when they come to the United States for a discussion, off the record, of U.S. relations with a given country—in this instance, Burma.

I expressed myself in the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning, as I do now on the floor of the Senate, that I have great difficulty in reconciling the American foreign policy of giving military aid in support of a military dictator in Burma, a dictator who keeps in jail, at the very time we supply the aid, a former democratic leader of Burma. What answer did I get? I got the same answer that I always get from the State Department, an answer I have always rejected, and one that I reject now.

The answer on the part of the nominee—and this is State Department policy—was that he thought we ought to go ahead with the aid and fulfill the commitments we have made. That is a fallacious argument. It is based upon the false assumption that we should go ahead and fulfill foreign aid programs, no matter what happens in a country, after we make the commitments. The American people are entitled to better treatment than that. The American people, I say to my administration—for I am a member of the party of this administration—are entitled to a change in that policy.

The time is long overdue when the executive branch of the Government should make clear to the world that the United States will not continue to support a military dictatorship anywhere

in the world. So far as I can see, with respect to human rights, there is no difference between a military dictatorship, Fascist in nature, and a Communist dictatorship. There are no human rights under any dictatorship. The policy of our Government to continue to support military dictatorships is costing us heavily in prestige around the world, because the policy proves us to be hypocritical. We cannot prate about supporting freedom and at the same time pour millions of dollars into any area of the world to support a military dictatorship.

That leads me to make a brief comment about South Vietnam. I am not at all impressed by the articles appearing in the newspapers today about the improvement in rapport between the Government of the United States and the Government of South Vietnam. Do you know why, Mr. President? It is because so long as Diem is the head of the Government of South Vietnam, we continue to support a tyrant, we continue to support a police-state dictator. We cannot justify that, in light of our professed ideals of seeking to support freedom for the masses of the people in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

I have said before, and shall continue to say as the historic debate on the foreign aid bill progresses, that the United States never should have gone into South Vietnam. I was opposed to our going into South Vietnam, because it was clear at the time that in going into South Vietnam, we were going in to support a tyrant, and we were going in alone.

We should get out of South Vietnam. I am not one who shudders and trembles at the knees when the blackmail argument is made that if we do not support its dictator, the country will go Communist. Let Khrushchev deal with dictators. They will cause him more trouble than they cause us. It is an unsound argument; it is a rationalization, seeking to justify an unsound policy, to argue that we ought to support Diem because if we do not, the Communists may take over. Everyone in this administration knows that if we withdrew our support from Diem, the anti-Communist forces in South Vietnam would throw him out within 90 days, and that hundreds of the exiles in Paris who are anti-Diem and anti-Communist would return to South Vietnam. Then there would be some chance of establishing in South Vietnam a moderate regime, anti-Communist in nature, but also democratic in purpose.

So I would have the United States get out of South Vietnam and save the American people the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars that our Government is pouring down that rat hole—and I use the descriptive phrase "rat hole" advisedly.

Also, it would save many precious American lives. There are places in this city that do not like to hear that said. They did not like to hear it when the senior Senator from Oregon spoke it the first time. But I shall continue to speak it. On the basis of the present policies that prevail there, South Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American boy. The senior Senator from Oregon will not

vote to continue to sacrifice the lives of American boys in South Vietnam.

Lastly, if the newspaper articles are accurate, I wish to say to Mr. Ball, the Under Secretary of State, before he even reaches the United States, that I find his newspaper reports most unconvincing in regard to Pakistan. They are most unconvincing. We should continue to make clear to Pakistan that there will be no foreign aid to that country so long as it continues to seek to build up ties between Pakistan and Red China.

If I read the news articles aright, and if the news articles are correct, Mr. Ball got no commitment from the so-called President of Pakistan. The word "President" in relation to the head of the Government of Pakistan should always be placed in quotation marks, because here again we are not dealing with a democrat; we are dealing with one who maintains a system of self-rule in Pakistan.

But I say to Mr. Ball and to the Secretary of State: So long as we do not have a commitment from Pakistan, one that is carried out in practice, not to build up its relations with Red China and provide for airplane landing rights and for various agreements in regard to defense, I am opposed to the sending of a single dollar of aid to Pakistan.

That is only part of my answer to the question the President of the United States raised some days ago, when he said to the American people that the opponents of foreign aid should tell where they believe cuts should be made. For weeks, I have been making a record of where the cuts should be made; and today I give him—again—part of my answer: Cut in Burma; cut in South Vietnam; cut in Pakistan. And in future speeches I will give him further suggestions.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now move that, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate adjourn until Monday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, September 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 6, 1963:

##### U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

David Rabinovitz, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Wisconsin, vice Patrick T. Stone, deceased.

##### UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives and alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 18th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1963:

##### To be representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.  
EDNA F. KELLY, U.S. Representative from the State of New York.  
WILLIAM S. MAILLARD, U.S. Representative from the State of California.  
Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.  
Charles W. Yost, of New York.

##### To be alternate representatives

Mercer Cook, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of Niger.  
Charles C. Stelle, of Maryland.  
Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York.  
Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois.  
Mrs. Jane Warner Dick, of Illinois.

## SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1963

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Judge of all men, in the fateful days which loom ahead for the Republic and for the world, we ask Thy enlightening grace upon the Members of this forum of our free land, which in the eyes of all the earth stands now in the valley of decision.

Thou who dost hate tyranny and any coercive fettering of the free will, hast made the mind and heart of each individual legislator a sacred inner closet to which the door is shut from all threats without, and where, in that hidden judgment hall, each steward of the Nation's welfare weighs the evidence, and then, even in a crowded chamber, deliberates and decides alone.

Give us such faith in the mental and moral integrity of those who by our side must face the same test and appraise the same testimony, that there will never be any doubt that divergent convictions grow out of the same pure patriotism.

Strengthen our belief that what is best for our America under God is best for the whole world, for Thou knowest that we have no dream of good for men and women and little children in our dear land that we do not passionately desire to share with all Thy children, of every race and kindred, beyond all the frowning frontiers of this now divided earth.

We ask it in the name of the Christ whose coming kingdom will unite all the sons of men. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington D.C. September 9, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

As in legislative session,

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the